A REPLY
TO THE
DEFENCE
OF
Dr. Stillingfleet;
BEING
A Counter Plot for *Union* between the *Proteſtants*, in oppoſition to the *Project* of others for *Conjunction* with the Church of *Rome*.

By the Authors
Of the *Modeſt and Peaceable Inquiry*.
Of the *Reflections*, (i.e.) the *Country Confor-*
Of the *Peaceable Deſigne*.

Then Abner *called to* Joab *and ſaid, ſhall the ſword devour for ever? Knoweſt thou not that it will be bitterneſs in the latter end? How long ſhall it be then ere thou bid the people return from following their Brethren.*

LONDON,
Printed for *Thomas Parkhurſt*, at the Bible and three Crowns in *Cheapſide* near *Mercers Chappel*. 1681.

E: G: Frichold 8. P. 33 P/6 (BHD)

1681
H 92
R

To the Right Honourable

THE

EARL of *HALLIFAX.*

May it pleaſe your Lordſhip.

THE Deſign of theſe Papers being for the *Glory* of the *King*, and the *Peace* of the *Church*, we cannot think it diſhonourable for any perſon of moderate Inclinations, and in a capacity to ſerve ſo good an end, to *favour* it. Your Lordſhip therefore being at preſent at the Helme in the Adminiſtration of the greateſt Affairs, will not, as we hope, receive with any *Diſdaine* this our humble *Dedication.*

Not that we concerne your Lordſhip in our little Conteſts, as the Book is Controverſal, for we know *Themiſtocles* cannot *fiddle*, but he can *govern a State*: but becauſe

the *Thing Designed* is so momentous, and *concerns Statesmen*, such as your Lordship is.

We do intend, no further avocation of your Honour from your other Imployment, than to look over onely the *Preface*, and the *last Half Sheet* of the Book: wherein you will find a Foundation laid, and *Materials* made ready. There is wanting onely the *Perfecting skill* of some *Master* builder, and then *Hands* to *work*.

We are sensible of the *Meanness* of such an *Offering* to so *great* and *judicious* a Person; and being conscious that the *blame* which we *deserve* upon that account is too much for *One*, there are *Two* of us to *bear* it.

Your Lordships humble Servants

John Humfrey,
Stephen Lob.

THE

THE PREFACE.

IT hath pleaſed God, that the hearts of moſt men at this preſent juncture (or at leaſt their faces) are ſet upon Union of the Proteſtants; and it is abſolutely neceſſary that ſomewhat be done in order to a firm and laſting one among us. Upon this point on all hands we ſeem to be agreed, We muſt Unite or we muſt be undone: but as for the means of obtaining this end, the differences are many.

Some among the Conformiſts ſeem to propoſe an Execution of the Pœnal Laws, as a ſure way of Uniting us: Others (as this Author of Dean Stillingfleets Defence, &c.) inſiſt on a Submiſſion to the Biſhops of the Univerſal Church to be the onely foundation of Unity in the Church. The Diſſenters differ from ſuch as are of theſe Opinions, and in the general aſſert, That if ever an Union be obtained, it muſt be by an Inſiſting onely on a Few, Certain, Neceſſary things as terms of Communion. That the utmoſt ſeverities of the Magiſtrate will rather, fill the minds of the Sufferers with Prejudices, againſt the Dictates of thoſe men whoſe moſt powerful Argument is the Sword, than Inlighten their Judgments, or Diſpoſe their Souls to any ſincere Compliances; and that the Notion of our Author, to wit, the Defender of the Dean of Pauls, is Schiſmatical.

Upon this account it is not a little time is ſpent in a Repreſeming the ſeveral Notions there are about the methods of Uniting us to be Ineffectual, the one Party miſliking the Propoſals made by the Other. But ſurely this is not the way to heal our breaches, or put an end to the Warme and Indecent Conteſts, that have been among us. For which Reaſon, though my principal aime is for Union, yet will not I preſume on any thing propoſed by us. I will onely acquaint the Reader with the Nature of the Ancient Conſtitution of our Government in Relation to Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, and thereby ſhew what will moſt effectually conduce to Unite us in a way the leaſt novel, and moſt conſiſtent with our Civil Eſtabliſhment.

The which I can no ſooner compaſs, but I ſhall be capacitated to demonſtrate to the World, That the Principles of the Diſſenter are very

much

much adapted for concord, not onely among themſelves, *but with the moderate* Epiſcoparians, *and very advantagious to the* State *in which they live.*

The Ancient Conſtitution *of our Government about Matters Eccleſiaſtical, is very excellently deſcrib'd in the* Neceſſary Doctrine, and Erudition of a Chriſtian man *compoſed by ſeveral Biſhops, and other great Doctors, and approved by Authority in the days of* Henry *the 8th.*

In this Judicious Tractate 'tis manifeſt

1. *That Church Government is* Jure Divino.

2. *That to the Conſtituting ſuch a Church Government thoſe Church Officers onely are neceſſary who are mention'd in the* New Teſtament.

3. *That in the New Teſtament there is mention made of no other Church Officers, but* Prieſts, *and* Deacons. *That no other Government is of Divine Right, but what is under the Conduct of* Biſhops, *or* Prieſts, *i. e.* Elders, *is evident, in that the* New Teſtament *mentioneth no other Governours, as Eccleſiaſtical, but the Biſhops, or Elders; whence, that Government, whoſe Conſtitution is ſuch, as that it becomes a Government on no other account, than that the Governours are of* humane make, *that Government cannot, formally conſidered, be of Divine Right, 'tis but* Humane, *though* circa Sacra.

4. *That* Biſhops, *or* Prieſts, *the ſole Governours of the Church are of* one, *and the* ſame Order, *their Power the ſame, their work the ſame, which is to preach the Word, Adminiſter Sacraments, and Exerciſe Diſcipline*

All this I collect from what is aſſerted in the aforeſaid Neceſſary Erudition *about the Sacrament of* Orders, *where 'tis ſaid,* That Biſhops, or Prieſts, and Deacons are the onely Orders mention'd in the New Teſtament. *And* of theſe two ORDERS *onely*, that is to ſay, *Prieſts, and Deacons*, Scripture maketh expreſs mention. That all others were afterward added by the Church. That the Duty, *and* Office of the *Biſhop, Prieſt,* [*or Elder*] conſiſteth in true Preaching and Teaching the word of God unto the People, in Diſpenſing, and Miniſtring the Sacraments of Chriſt; *in Loſing, and Abſoiling from ſin*, ſuch perſons as be ſorry, *and* truly Penitent for the ſame, *and* EXCOMMUNICATING ſuch, as BE GUILTY IN MANIFEST CRIMES, and WILL NOT BE RE-

REFORMED OTHERWISE, *and* finally, in Praying for the Whole Church of Christ, *and* ſpecially for the flock, committed unto 'em.

Thus the Order of a Biſhop, or Prieſt is one and the ſame; whoſe Office is, not onely to Preach, and Adminiſter Sacraments, but moreover to exerciſe Diſcipline, *namely in Loſing, and* Abſolving from ſin, ſuch perſons as be ſorry, and truly Penitent, *and in* Excommunicating the Obſtinately Vitious, *As much as if it had been ſaid, that Church Government, and the Office of a Biſhop, or Elder, is of Divine Right.*

The Office of the Deacons *in the Primitive Church was* partly in Miniſtring Meat, and Drink, and other Neceſſaries to the poor people found of the Church, partly alſo in Miniſtring to the Biſhops, and Prieſts, and in doing their duty in the Church.

Hereby 'tis apparent that Deacons, *as they were not by Office Preachers, nor Diſpenſers of the Sacraments, neither were they Governours of the Church. The Government of the Church being committed unto the Biſhops, or Presbyters* onely. *The which being ſo, 'twill as I humbly apprehend, follow, That* Church Government, *according to Chriſts Inſtitution*, was ſeated in thoſe Particular Societies, *which were under the care, and conduct of Biſhops, or Elders, every ſuch ſociety, call it* Parochial, *or* Congregational, *being a Compleat Goſpel Church,* (i.e.) *a Church whoſe Elders, or Biſhops have as Entire a power for the Exerciſe of Diſcipline in their Congregations, as for the Diſpenſing the word or Adminiſtring the Sacraments. This is not onely to be found in the* Neceſſary Erudition, *but moreover there are Intimations enough in other Diſcourſes publiſhed in* Henry *the Eights time, to incline a Judicious mind to conclude, That the Office of a* Prieſt, *and* Biſhop *is One, and the ſame; and conſequently that* Particular Parochial, *or* Congregational Churches *are of* Divine Inſtitution.

I have obſerved in the Sum of Chriſtianity, *compos'd by* Francis Lambert *of* Avynyon, *a Treatiſe Publiſhed* An. 1536. *That the Notion of the* Sameneſs *of the Order of a Biſhop, or Elder appeared in the world with ſome kind of boldneſs. For although this* Lambert *in his Epiſtle to* Sebaſtian, *Prince of* Lauſane, *doth aſſert, That there be* MANY Biſhops of ONE City, for (*ſaith he*) every City hath ſo many Biſhops, as it hath true Evangeliſts, *or* Preachers, *For* every Preacher of the Truth, *&c.* is a true Biſhop, although

he

he be not call'd ſo of many; Biſhops be only Prophets of Truth, and there ſhould be ſo many Biſhops, as the multitude of People requireth, Verily Every Pariſh ought to have its proper Biſhop. *And in the Treatiſe it ſelf, chap.* 5. In every City, Town, *and* Village there ought to be many Biſhops *(i. e.)* Evangeliſts, *or* Preachers, after the quantity of places, and multitude of people. If many Pariſhes be ſo great, that one Biſhop is not ſufficient for them, let them be divided, *and* to every part a Biſhop aſſigned. *This and much more in* Lambert. *Notwithſtanding which, this Treatiſe is publiſhed by* Triſtram Rewell, *and dedicated to* Queen Anne, *wife of* Henry *the* 8*th. A thing that would not have been done but that this Opinion was very common at that time, and within ſeven years after declar'd to be the ſenſe of the* Church of England *as I have evinc'd out of the* Neceſſary Erudition. *But*

5. *That the* Superiority of one Biſhop over another, *or of a* Biſhop *over a* Presbyter *is of* Humane, *not of* Divine Right.

Dioceſan Biſhops, Metropolitane, or Patriarchal are not found in Sacred writings, and concerning this, the neceſſary Erudition *is moſt expreſs, in theſe words, And* whereas we have thus ſummarily declar'd what is the Office, and miniſtration, which in Holy Scripture hath been committed to Biſhops, and Prieſts, and in what things it conſiſteth as is before rehearſed, *leſt* peradventure it might be thought to ſome perſons, That ſuch Authorities, Powers, *and* Juriſdictions as *Patriarchs, Primates, Archbiſhops, and Metropolitanes* now have, *or* heretofore at any time have had Juſtly, and Lawfully over other *Biſhops*, were given them by God in holy Scripture. We think it expedient, and neceſſary, That all men ſhould be adverti's'd, and taught, That all ſuch lawful Powers, and Authorities of ANY one Biſhop over another, were, and be given to them, by the Conſent, Ordinance, and Poſitive Laws of men ONELY, AND NOT BY ANY ORDINANCE OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE. *And* all other Power, *and* Authority, *which* any Biſhop hath uſed, or exerciſed over another, which hath not been given to him by ſuch conſent, and Ordinance of Men,, (as is aforeſaid) is in very deed *no* LAWFULL POWER, *but* PLAIN USURPATION AND TYRANNY. *So far the* Chriſtian Erudition. *From whence 'tis manifeſt, That according unto them,* Dioceſan Epiſcopacy *is of* Humane Right onely *(i. e.) Any one Biſhops Ruling over another Biſhop, or Presbyter,*

byter, is what the Scriptures do not direct unto, and consequently 'tis not of Divine Right, neither is it any further Lawful, than according unto the Laws of the Land in which 'tis Exercis'd.

Though the Power of Diocesane Bishops, as 'tis Circa Sacra, may be called Ecclesiastical, yet if we consider its Origine, and Source, we shall find it to be but Civil, seated primarily in the Civil Magistrate, that 'tis of an humane make, and so far, but no further Lawful, than as Sanction'd by the Laws of the Land. Diocesane Bishops as such are not immediately owing unto God, but unto our Civil Governours for their Being, 'tis on them their sole dependance is, and on them they relie for the Continuance of their Power. The King, Lords, and Commons assembled in Parliament can, as they see cause, make what Alterations they please in the Episcopal, or Diocesan Government, Though they cannot alter any Divine Law, yet they can change any Law that receives its Being from themselves. Though they cannot alter the Office of a Presbyter, or Bishop, which receives its Being from the Institution, or Ordinance of Jesus Christ, yet they may correct, or amend any thing in the Humane, viz. The Diocesane Constitution. They can enlarge, or narrow, any Dioces, yea pull down one, and Erect another. They can add unto, or take from the Episcopal Jurisdiction, as they judge Expedient.

That this was the sense of the Church of England in Henry the 8ths. time, yea and in most ages since an Episcopal Government has been established in this Kingdome, and consequently the Antient Constitution of our Government, is not only manifest, from what hath been already taken out of the Necessary Erudition, but from other passages, that are in that excellent treatise, and some other Considerations that I will insist on. As

First, The Power, that hath ever been acknowledged to be seated in the Kings of this Realm, concerning the exempting any particular Churches from an Episcopal Jurisdiction evinces it.

If Episcopal Jurisdiction be of Divine Right, it lies not in the power of any Prince to alter it, If every Parish Presbyter is, according to the Scriptures, an Officer inferiour to some Diocesane Bishop, the exempting such a Presbyter from Episcopal Jurisdiction is out of the power of any man. 'Twas a known Rule in our Land even in the days of Popery, That no Law of man can alter, or disanul any Law of God, If then our Princes ever thought themselves to have been invested with a Power of exempting any Presbyter from Episco-

pal Juriſdiction, 'tis evident that they look not on that Juriſdiction to be of Divine Right.

But that our Princes judg'd themſelves to have ſuch a Power, is notorious, from the many Inſtances that can be given of their exerciſing it, Whoſoever conſults the Learned Dr. Burnets Hiſtory of the Refor. part. 1. lib. 3. *will find, That* Ethelbert *exempted a Monaſtry at* Canterbury *with ſome Churches belonging unto it from the* Juriſdiction of *the* Archbiſhop, *and his Succeſſors. King* Ina's *Charter to the* Abbey *of* Glaſſenbury *exemps them from the Biſhops Juriſdiction. The like did King* Offa *concerning the Monaſtry of St.* Albans *An.* 793. Kenulph *King of* Mercia *that at* Abington *Anno* 821. *and* Knut, *that at St.* Edmvndbury *An.* 1020. *Yea and there are ſeveral places at this very time exempt from Epiſcopal Juriſdiction.*

Whatever our Princes in after Ages might loſe as to the Exerciſe of their juſt Power, 'tis certain, that Henry 8th. *reaſſumed it, as appears by his diſmembring ſome* Dioceſſes, *and by his removing ſome Churches from one Juriſdiction to another. For this Conſult Dr.* Burnets Hiſtory of Reformation, *part 1. lib. 3. page* 301. *where you'l find the Complaint of the* Roman *party beyond the Sea concerning the Kings encroaching on the Juriſdiction of the Church,* &c.—— *to which 'twas anſwered, That* the Diviſion of the Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction whether of Patriarchs, Primates, Metropolitanes, or Biſhops was according to the *Roman* Law Regulated by the Emperours, Of which the Antient Councils always approv'd. And in *England* when the Biſhoprick of *Lincoln*, being judg'd of too great an extent, the Biſhoprick of *Ely* was taken out of *it*, it was done only *by the King*, with the conſent of his Clergy, *and* Nobles.

'Tis alſo evident out of Dr. Burnets Hiſt. of the Ref. part 1. l. 3 p. 267. *That this great* Prince *gave out ſuch a Commiſſion to* Bonner, *and it may be to others alſo, as makes it moſt manifeſt, that* Dioceſan Biſhops *were not of God's, but only of the Magiſtrate's Inſtitution. Hence* Bonner *in his Commiſſion from the* King *moſt gratefully acknowledges that he received it only from the King's bounty, and muſt deliver it up again when it ſhould pleaſe his Majeſty to call for it, even as Juſtices of the Peace,* &c. *whoſe Commiſſion is* ad Pacitum. *Moreover Lay-men had Eccleſiaſtical Dignities. The* E. *of* Hartford *ſix Prebends promiſſed him, as the Lord* Cromwal *in* H. 8.

was

was made Dean of Wells. *A thing very ordinary at that time,* Dr. Burnets Hiſt. of the Refor. part 2.

Thus a Dioceſane Epiſcopacy at beſt was judg'd but an humane Creature, owing to the Magiſtrate alone for it's Riſe, and Conſervation.

Secondly, *This ſeems to be the ſenſe of the Reformers in* Edward *the* 6th. *time who were under the Influence of that great Divine, and Bleſſed Martyr* Archbiſhop Cranmer. *In* Henry 8th. *days* Cranmer *did his Utmoſt for the promoting a Reformation, the which, he did withal the Speed and Prudence the Ilneſs of the times would permit, further attempt to carry on under* King Edward, *and what he did, was ſo highly approv'd of by all, who were hearty for a Reformation, that whoever conſiders how Unanimous the truly Proteſtant Biſhops were, in Concurring with this great Prelate* Cranmer, *cannot but encline to think, That their Principles in moſt things about Church Diſcipline were the ſame,* (i. e.) *they were for the Divine Right of Biſhops or Presbyters, even when they judg'd the Superiority of a Biſhop to a Presbyter to be but Humane.*

That this may appear to be the ſenſe of Cranmer, *I will only beſeech my* Reader *to compare what was done under* King Edw. 6th. *by this great Prelate, with his* Judgment *concerning a Dioceſan Epiſcopacy under* Henry the 8th.

In Henry 8ths. *time* Cranmer *in anſwer to that Queſtion,* Whether Biſhops, *or* Prieſts were firſt? *did aſſert, That* the Biſhops, and Prieſt, were at one time, *and* were no two things, but both *One Office* in the beginning of Chriſts Religion, *That* in the New Teſtament, he that is appointed to be a BISHOP or PRIEST, needeth no Conſecration by the Scripture, *for* ELECTION, *or* APPOINTING thereto is ſufficient. *This was then* Cranmers *Judgment and I cannot underſtand that he did at any time in the leaſt vary from it, for in the* Neceſſary Erudition, *which he ſubſcribed, there is nothing aſſerted, but what is either Conſiſtent with, or an approbation of what was the Arebbiſhops Opinion about theſe points.*

'Tis true Cranmer *was ſo Zealous an Aſſerter to the* Kings Supremacy, *that he ſeem'd to be of that Opinion, which doth now appear by the name of* Eraſtianiſme, *for he held,* That a Biſhop, or Prieſt by the Scripture is neither commanded, *nor* forbidden to Excommunicate, but, where the *Laws* of any *Region* give him Authority to Excommunicate, there he ought to uſe the ſame,

same, &c. *But from this he must be considered to have received, because he subscribed the Necessary* Erudition, *where 'tis expresst, That a part of the Priests or Bishops Office is according to the Scriptures to Excommunicate,* &c. *as well as Teach, and Administer the Sacraments.*

To all this add the Progress Cranmer *made under* Edw. 6. *in the Reformation, how far he went, and how much farther he would have gone, had not the Iniquity of those times been so exceeding great, and the Reign of this worthy* Prince *so very short. 'Tis well known that he went so far as to tempt Dr.* Heylin *to conclude King* Edwards *death no* Infelicity *to the* Church of England, *and to provoke Queen* Elizabeth *to say, That they had stript the Church too much of its external Splendour and Magnificence, That 'twas requisite to make some alteration in the Articles to the end a Compliance of the Roman Catholicks might be more easie. What I have insisted on in this place about* Cranmer *is taken out of Dr.* Burnets *History, and a* Record *in him* ex M.SS. *D.* Stillingfleet.

3. *Such is the present* Prerogative of his Majesty *in* Ecclesiastical *as well as Civil Affairs, that the asserting the Divine Right of a Diocesane Episcopacy is inconsistent with it.*

The King *is the* Supream Head *of the* Church, *as well as of the* State; *for which Reason, he hath Power to appoint Officers to look after the management of Affairs in the One, as in the Other: But if the Diocesan Bishops depend not so much on the Prince for their Superiority and Power in making an Authoritative Inspection into Ecclesiastical Affairs, as the Civil Magistrate; who is it that is his Majesties Commissionated Officer about Ecclesiastical affairs? Tis either the* Diocesane *or* None. *But if the Diocesane as such receives his Commission from Jesus Christ, even as the* Apostles *did, then they are* Gods *Officers, and not the* Kings. *And if so, seeing the* King *doth nothing but by his Officers, that is, by such as act by a Commission received from him, the King hath in this respect lost at least the Exercise of his Prerogative. But if they are the Kings Officers, and depend as much on the King as the Civil, then their Diocesan Episcopacy is not of Divine, 'tis but of Humane Right.*

We acknowledge that 'tis the sense of the Church of England, *that Princes are Ordain'd of God to Govern Ecclesiastical, as well as other Persons: and that therefore, if we consider such as are appointed by the King to govern under him* Circa Sacra, *as the Officers of God* Funda-

Fundamentally, *and not* Formally, *it may be granted. But when we ſpeak of the* Officers of Chriſt *in Contradiſtinction to the* Officers of the King, *we mean ſuch, whoſe Authority is from God, and remains good, though the Prince ſhould oppoſe it, as in the caſe of the Primitive Officers of Divine Inſtitution, who being forbidden to Preach in Chriſts name, could reply,* Whether we ſhall obey God or Man Judge ye. *The Office of a Presbyter, or Congregational Biſhop is ſo much of God, that what right ſoever the Magiſtrate may have concerning Nomination, Election, or Preſentation, or Appointing of any ſuch Eccleſiaſtical Miniſters, his Prohibition cannot make void that Commiſſion he hath received from Jeſus Chriſt. But ſuch as are* Officers of the King, *whether about the* matters of the Lord, *or about the* King (i. e.) *whether* Circa ſacra, *or about* Civil *Affairs, 'tis in the Power of the Supream Magiſtrate to give or take his Commiſſion, as it pleaſeth him, yea to direct to the Number of ſuch Officers, appointing them their peculiar work, and to alter and change as the neceſſity of Affairs, and State of the National Conſtitution ſhall require.*

There muſt be a regard had unto the preſent temper, and ſtate of the Kingdom, in which the Church is, and a ſuiting the Eccleſiaſtical Affairs ſo far as they may have an influence on the State after ſuch a manner, as is moſt conducive to the more firm eſtabliſhment of the Fundamental *Conſtitution, and conſequently Peace of the State, to which end the Civil Magiſtrate muſt ſtill firmly adhere to that known* Rule *by which King* Henry *profeſſed to walk, which is expreſſed in the neceſſary Erudition,* viz. The Scripture doth teach, That all Chriſtian People, *as* well as Prieſts and Biſhops, *as* all other ſhould be obedient unto Princes, *and* Poteſtates of the World; For the Truth is, that God Conſtituted *and* Ordained the Authority of Chriſtian Kings and Princes to be the moſt High, and Supream above all other Powers, and Officers in this World, in the Regiment and Government of their People, and committed to them as unto the chief leads of their Commonwealths, the Cure and Overſight of all the People which be in their Realms, and Dominions, *without any exception*: and to them of *Right*, and by *Gods Commandment*, belongeth not only to prohibit Unlawfull Violence, *to* correct Offenders *by* Corporal Death, *or* other puniſhment, *to* Cenſure Moral Honeſty among their Subjects, according to the Laws of their Realms, *to* defend Juſtice, and to procure the Publick Weal, *and* Common Peace *and* Tranquility in Outward

and

and Earthly things: But *Especially* and *Principally*, to Defend the Faith of Christ, *and his* Religion, *to* conserve and maintain the true Doctrine of Christ, *and* all such as be true Preachers and Setters forth thereof, *and* to abolish all Abuses, Heresies and Idolatries, *and to* punish with Corporal Pain, such as of malice be the occasion of the same. *And Finally*, to Oversee, *and* cause that the said Bishops and Priests, *do* execute their Pastoral Office truly and faithfully, *and* especially in those points, which by Christ and his Apostles were given and committed unto them; *and* in case they shall be negligent in any part thereof, or would not diligently execute the same, *to* cause them to redouble and supply their lack. And if they obstinately withstand their Princes kind monition, and will not mend their Faults: then and in such case to put others in their rooms and places. And God hath also commanded the said Bishops and Priests to obey with all humbleness and Reverence both Kings, and Princes, and Governours, and all their Laws, not *being contrary to the Laws of God*, whatsoever they be, *and that* not only *propter iram*, but also *propter Conscientiam, that is to say*, not only for fear of punishment, *but* also for discharge of Conscience.

Thus the Power of the Magistrate over all Persons, to wit, Ecclesiastical *and* Civil, *is according to the Ordinance of God; and that 'tis a Part of the Magistrates Office to Defend the Faith of Christ, to maintain the true Doctrine and the Preachers thereof, and to Abolish all Abuses*, &c. *the which must be done, not only by keeping to the Rule of the Gospel, but in conjunction therewith, by taking a special care, that no unnecessary thing be suffered, that in its Tendency is destructive of the Peace of the State. If the present constitution of the Government of the Church, as it is National, and of humane Right onely be in any Respects Inconsistent with the Publick Weal of the Kingdom, tis necessary, that it be alter'd; especially when an Alteration in some little things, may abundantly contribute unto the Lasting Peace, both of Church and State.*

But if the Church Government as Diocesane *or* National *be of Divine Right, there can be no Alteration of it, and consequently, seeing the setting up any of the* Kings Officers *to Inspect Ecclesiastical Affairs, is an Altering the Diocesan Constitution, the* Prince *durst not, though encouraged by an Act of Parliament, enter on it. What is of Divine Right is Sacred, and must not be touch'd, 'tis dangerous to come too near*

near that Mount. For which Reaſon, how miſchievous ſoever the Eccleſiaſtical-National-Government, *may in Proceſs of time be unto the Civil; the Civil, not the Eccleſiaſtical muſt be Altered. That there may be an Adjuſting matters in debate between the* Dioceſane, *and the* State, *the* State *muſt ſubmit unto the Dioceſane. For the King according to this Hypotheſis hath nothing to do with Church Affairs, which are wholly by the word of God confined to Churchmen, among whoſe number the* King *cannot be juſtly mention'd, neither may the King take any Cognizance of what is done among them, nor may they hold their Courts in his, but only in their own Name, or rather in Jeſus Chriſts. A Notion ſo inconſiſtent with his Majeſties juſt* Prerogative, *and the Powers of Parliaments, that as it doth deſtroy the* Former, *in like manner it doth ſo very much limit the* Latter, *as to* Alter *the* Fundamental *Conſtitution of our Government.*

By this time I preſume it may appear with ſome Conviction to the Reader.

1. *That* a Parochial, or Congregational Church Government is, *according to the Church of* England, Jure Divino.

2. *That the* Dioceſane, *or* National Government *as ſuch is* Jure Humano, *and for its particular Form, muſt be ſuch in all ages, as our Civil Governours Judge moſt meet, as a Means for the Preſervation of Parochial Diſcipline, and the great Ends of the Civil Conſtitution.*

Theſe things being ſo, A Declaring this true Church of *England* Principle *to be ſtill according to the Sentiments of our Governours, will* Relieve tender Conſciences among Diſſenters, *and* ſufficiently gratifie *any* moderate Conformiſt *to the Ending all our Diviſions, without an* Embaſing his Majeſties Prerogative.

1. *The Eſtabliſhing a Parochial, or Congregational-Church-Diſcipline by* Law, *is the great thing the Diſſenters deſire, and what may be done conſiſtently with the Antient Conſtitution of the Government of this Realm, to the fixing the deſired Firm and laſting Union among all ſorts of ſound Proteſtants.*

Theſe Aſſemblies once eſtabliſhed, as ſo many Compleat Particular Churches, *whoſe* Paſtors *have full Power for the Adminiſtring all Ordinances, and the exerciſing Diſcipline over thoſe who do freely and of choice ſubmit thereunto, may notwithſtanding leſſer Differences, be conſidered as United unto one another, in that they Profeſs the ſame Faith, Preach the ſame Word, and Adminiſter the ſame Sacraments.*

For the Proof hereof consult the Necessary Erudition, *where tis said,* "*That the Unity of the Holy Church of Christ is not divided by Di-*"*stance of Place, nor by* Diversity of Traditions *and* Ceremonies, "diversely observed in divers Churches, *for good Order of the* "*same: And though in Traditions, Opinions, and Policies, there was* "*some Diversity among them* [(i.e.) *the* Churches of Corinth of Ephese, "&c.] *likewise as the Church of* England, Spain, Italy, Pole, *be* "*not separate from the Unity, but be one Church in God, notwithstan-*"*ding that among them, there is great distance of Place,* Diversity "*of* Traditions, *not in all things Unity of Opinions,* Alteration in "Rites, Ceremonies *and* Ordinances, *or Estimation of the same*—— "such Diversity in Opinions, *and* other outward Manners and "Customes *of Policy, doth* not dissolve and break the Unity "*which is in* One God, One Faith, One Doctrine of Christ and "his Sacraments *preserv'd and kept in these* several Churches "*without any Superiority or Prehemінence, that one Church by Gods* "*Law may, or ought to Challenge over another.*

Thus Particular Parochial, or Congregational Churches may be United in One God, One Faith, One Doctrine of Christ and his Sacraments, even where there is some difference between them in lesser matters. What though in one Parish there is a Liturgy, *in another a* Directory, *shall this hinder Union? Don't even the Papists themselves acknowledge, that the Church of* England *was very closely United, even among themselves, notwithstanding the several different* Offices *there were in use among us in the times of Popery? One* Office *after the use of* Sarum, *another after the use of* York, *of* Bangor, &c. *and yet all United. Moreover what more common than to observe many little differences in* Civil Corporations, *even where they are all United in one head. A consideration sufficient to evince the Union of Parochial Churches to be Possible, notwithstanding some Remaining Differences in Customs,* &c.

In these Kingdoms there are a multitude of Particnlar Corporations, *and* little Policies, *whose Customs and modes of Government within themselves, are very Different. The particular Laws by which they are govern'd as a Particular Body Corporate are of as many different kinds as there are Cities, Towns, or Parishes; but yet* All United, *in that they swear Allegiance to his Majesty, and submit themselves to the General Laws of the Land. The different Customs of different places do not in the least break the Union of the Nation.*

And

And why may it not be ſo in the Church? *What Reaſon can there be given, why the Union of many a Civil Society or Aſſociation may be, notwithſtanding the different Cuſtomes are among them, but the Union of many Particular-Parochial-Churches cannot be, unleſs they all agree in every little thing.*

Methinks it is as Reaſonable to plead for a deſtroying the Particular Cuſtomes, *and* Charters *of* Burroughs, *Corporations, and Cities as the only way to Unicn in the Civil Government, as 'tis to aſſert, That nothing but an Uniformity among every Parochial or Congregational Church can Unite us in the Eccleſiaſtical. What though there are ſome differences among Parochial Churches as to their Cuſtomes and modes of Worſhip, ſo long as they agree in* One Faith, One Lord, One Baptiſm: *So long as they all Profeſs the ſame Faith, Preach the ſame Word, Adminiſter the ſame Sacraments, and ſubmit unto the ſame* Civil Government: *So long as they all Swear Allegiance to to their Prince, and Subſcribe any Teſt to aſſure the World they are ſound Proteſtants, the which being ſo, what hinders a firm and laſting Union?*

Certainly, This is enough to ſhew, that their Union, if no more, is as much as that between One City and another, One Corporation and another, and that their differences are no greater, (if ſo great) than thoſe between one City and another. The which being ſo, An Altering the Preſent Laws about Conformity, and an Eſtabliſhing ſuch New ones, as ſhall be Judged neceſſary by our Governours for the defence and ſafety of a Parochial or Congregational Church-Diſcipline, as well as for the Regulating his Majeſties Officers Circa Sacra, *will Unite us, and put an end to that Horrid ſin of* Schiſm, *that hath theſe many years abounded in the midſt of us. Let the Diſſenters be permitted to Embrace the Laws and Cuſtomes of their Fore-fathers in the Apoſtles days about Church-Diſcipline, and the Mode of Worſhip, and they are Relieved, the which may be done without any Injury to the Conſcience of any ſound Proteſtant of the Epiſcopal Perſwaſion. I ſay,*

2. *This cannot but ſatisfie any moderate* Epiſcoparian, *who may, if he pleaſe, firmly abide by thoſe Ceremonies he now doth. He may ſtill Read the ſame Prayers among ſuch as are of his own Opinion. He may wear the ſame Veſtments, and addreſs himſelf to his Majeſties Officer the Lord Biſhop, as unto his* Ordinary *for Councel and Advice. And if his Ordinary or Dioceſan be an* Elder *(for that is left to the Supream Magiſtrate to appoint) he may look on him [though in truth as* ſuch,

he being only the Kings Officer Circa Sacra *as a Bishop who is of an* Order Superiour *to that of a Presbyter, and so exercise Discipline as he Receives Encouragement from him.*

If there be any entring on the Ministry, who think a Diocesane Episcopacy *to be* Jure Divino, *and is called unto a* Parish *or* Congregation *of the same Judgment. This* Candidate *may (if the Kings Officer be an Elder, and of the same mind with him) apply himself unto him, as unto his* Diocesane, *and receive* Orders *from him, and do all things as now, unless our Governours Judge meet to make any Alteration as to the use of some Ceremonies, Only let none be by Law compelled to do so.*

Let those that are so weak, *as to think a* Diocesane Episcopacy *to be of Divine Right enjoy the Liberty of their Consciences, the which being attended but with the vouchsafing the like Liberty unto others, I know not why they may not be satisfied. We are not for the Pulling down Lord Bishops, nor for an Alienating Church Lands. If it seem good to our Governours to continue them, we only desire, that the* Nature *of their* Office *be declared to be no other than what it was Antiently in this Kingdom, which is,* That they are meerly the Kings Creatures, That all they do must be in the Kings Name, and by vertue of a Commission receiv'd from him: That as *such* they are only the Kings Magistrates, that act *Circa Sacra*, That their work is *only to see that* the Bishops *or* Presbyters *within* their allotted Precincts *discharge their Duty not only in leading Godly Lives, but in Preaching the word, administring the Sacraments, and exercising Discipline according to the Rule of the Gospel.*

We are far from pulling down such Bishops, for we rather wish that whereas there is now one, there might be five, nor are we for the alienating Church Land any more than we are for the taking from his Majesties *other* Civil Officers, *those* Pensions *are allowed them for their great services. A thing we esteem as necessary, and highly expedient as what doth not only conduce very much to the Encouragement of all sorts of* Learning; *the* equal *Administration of Justice, but as what advanceth the* Honour *and* Grandeur *of the State. But,*

3. *This doth no way* Embase his Majesties Prerogative *in matters Ecclesiastical, It doth rather make it the more* Grand *and* August. *His Majesty is hereby acknowledged to be the* Supream Head *of the Church. All Officers* Circa Sacra *depend as much on his Majesties Pleasure for their Places as any other Civil Officers. 'Tis in the Kings*

Name

Name they must act, by vertue of a Commission received from him, whereby the King *is Recognized as the sole Governour of the Kingdom, and hath no Competitors with him, nor is he in danger of Forreign Usurpations.*

To summe up all, Let all such Particular Congregational, *or* Parochial Churches, *that are of Divine Institution according to the sense of the Old, and most true Church of* England, *be by* Act of Parliament *declar'd to be so, and taken under the Protection of the Laws, and the Dissenters are satisfied: The which (as hath been prov'd) may be done without any wrong to the consciences of the Conformist.*

This is the utmost I shall propose leaving it to the Wisdom of the Nation to Regulate, and Order the Constitution *so far as it is National and of Humane Make, as they Judge most Expedient. The* States-men *know best, how to alter, correct, or amend any thing in the present Frame, for which reason, Modesty doth best become Divines, whonever succeed in any undertakements beyond their Sphere. If no encroachments be made on what is of Divine Institution no wrong can be done us.*

I desire the Dean, and his Substitute to consider this Propofal, *which is but a Revival of what was on our first leaving* Rome, *strenuously asserted, as the* Onely *way to break all the Designs of the Papists about Church Discipline; From the corruptions of which did precede all the Popes Tyranous Usurpations. Certainly the Establishing this Notion cannot but be of extraordinary use, as it Erects a* Partition *Wall between the Reformation, and the Corruptions of the* Roman *Church, as it is adjusted for the silencing all Differences among our selves, the healing our Breaches, and the fixing a firm and lasting Unisn among all sound Protestants, whether* Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, *or* meer Anabaptist.

I humbly apprehend this to be enough to evince, That the Dissenters are not such Enemies to Union as some have Asserted, nor are they for the destroying a National Church Government. *They are onely against Unaccountable Innovations, even such as tend to the Ruine of the Old Protestant National Church, which as such is but of Humane Institution, and in all ages must be of such a Peculiar Form, as is best suited to those great Ends,* viz. *Gods Glory in the Flourishing of particular Parochial, or Congregational Churches and the Peace of the State.*

The Dissenters do know, that as One Particular Church is not to depend on another, as to be Accountable *thereunto, when at any time she may abuse her Power, yet* All *are accountable unto the* Magistrate *of that Land in which they Live, and that such is the state of things with us, that what person soever is griev'd, either by a Presbyter or Bishop, or by any* Inferiour Officer Circa Sacra, *he may make his* Appeal *to the Supream Magistrate,*

with

with whom all Appeals on Earth are finally Lodg'd. *Whatever the* Deans Substitute *may assert, 'tis most undoubtedly true, that* no Appeal *can be* justly made from our King *unto* the Pope, *or* any Colledge of Catholick Bishops whatsoever. *That herein as our* Author *dissents from the* Church of England, *we do heartily agree with* her.

That the sound Protestant Party among the Sons of the Church of England *do accord with the Dissenters about this great Point, is not only evident from what a Conformist hath written in the following Treatise, but from what is asserted by the Judicious* Dr. Burnet *in the* History of the Reformation. *The which I do the more chearfully insist on, that the world may see, How the Dissenters have been misrepresented, and How clear they are from any Seditious or Factious Principles concerning Church Discipline.*

In Dr. Burnets Preface to the History of the Reformation, p. 1. *for which the whole Kingdom have given the Dr. thanks: 'tis asserted,* That in *Henry* the 8ths time, 'twas an Establish'd Principle, That every National Church is a compleat Body within it self, so that the Church of *England* with the Authority and Concurrence of their Head and King, might examine or Reform all Errors or Corruptions, whether in Doctrine or Worship. *Moreover in the Preamble of that Act by which this Principle was fix'd, 'tis declared,* That the *Crown of England* was *Imperial,* and that the Nation was a Compleat Body within it self, with a full Power to give Justice in all Cases, *Spiritual,* as well as *Temporal.* And that in the *Spiritualty,* as there had been at all times, so there were then men of that Sufficiency and Integrity, that they might Declare and Determine all Doubts within the Kingdom, And that several Kings as *Ed.*1.*Edw.*3.Ric.2 .and *Hen.*4. had by several Laws Preserv'd the Liberties of the Realm both *Spiritual and Temporal* from the Annoyance of the See of *Rome,* and other *Forreign Potentates,* Hist. Ref. p.1. p.127.

Furthermore, the same Judicious Author, *by an* Extract *out of the* Necessary Erudition, *and out of the* Kings Book de Differentia Regiæ & Ecclesiasticæ Potestatis, *out of* Gardiners de vera Obedientia, *and* Bonners Prefix'd Epistle, *and out of a Letter written by* Stokesly *Bishop of* London, *and* Tonstall *Bishop of* Duresm, *hath made it evident that the Church in* Henry 8. *did not only assert the Kings* Supremacy, *but as a Truth in Conjunction therewith, held,* That in the Primitive Church, the Bishops in their Councels made Rules for Ordering their Dioceses which they only called CANONS or RULES, nor had they any *Compulsive Authority,* but what was deriv'd from the Civil Sanction.

A sufficient evincement that they did not believe General Councils *to be by Jesus Christ made the* Regent part *of the* Catholick Church, *neither did*

did they believe their Determinations, or Decrees, to lay any Obligation on the Conſcience, unleſs Sanction'd by the Magiſtrates command.

To this Dr. Burnet *ſpeaks excellently well in his* Preface to the Second Part of the Hiſt. Refor. *'The* Juriſdiction *of* Synods *or* Councils *is 'founded either on the Rules of Expediency or Brotherly Correſpondence, or 'on the force of Civil Laws; For when the Chriſtian Belief had not the 'ſupport of Law, Every Biſhop taught his own Flock the beſt he could, and 'gave his Neighbours ſuch an account of his Faith at, or ſoon after his Con-'ſecration, as ſatisfied them, and ſo maintain'd the* Unity *of the Church. 'The* Formality of Synods *grew up in the Church from the Diviſion of the 'Roman Empire, and the Dignity of the ſeveral Cities, which is a thing 'ſo well known, and ſo plainly acknowledged by the Writers of all ſides, 'that it were a needleſs Impoſing on the Readers Patience to ſpend time to 'prove it. Such as would underſtand it more perfectly, will find it in* de 'Marca, *the late* Archbiſhop *of* Paris's *Books* de Concordia Imperii & 'Sacerdotii, *and in* Blondels *works* de La Primaute de l'Egliſe, *None 'can Imagine there is a Divine Authority in that, which ſprang from ſuch 'a Beginning. The* Major *part of* Synods *cannot be ſuppoſed to be in mat-'ters of Faith, ſo aſſiſted from Heaven, that the leſſer part muſt neceſſari-'ly Acquieſce in their Decrees, or that the* Civil powers *muſt always* mea-'ſure their Laws *by their Votes, eſpecially where intreſt doth viſibly turn 'the Scales, ſo far Dr.* Burnet. *The contrary unto which being aſſerted by the* Deans Subſtitute, *'tis Apparent, that he doth abundantly recede from the true* Church of England, *not only to the Reproach of his Profeſſion, but of the firſt Reformation, and grief of the ſober and moderate Conformiſt.*

This I thought neceſſary to ſuggeſt, that I might engage the Reader *to conſider with what Injuſtice this Author treats, not only thoſe who diſſent from the Church in ſome things, but the Sober Conformiſt alſo, who is a through Church man, by Repreſenting us all as Enemies both to Church and State, as if the adhereing unto Old Proteſtant Principles about Church Diſcipline had been the Overt Act of a Spirit Seditious and Phanatical.*

Having thus ſo fully ſhewn, How eaſy tis to put an end to the miſchevous Diviſions, which have, for ſome years paſt, prov'd very dangerous to this Kingdome. I will not inlarge on every little thing that our Authour may think deſerves our Animadverſions.

The Rude, and ſlovenly methods he hath taken to aſperſe his Adverſaries are ſuch as do rather evince the Feebleneſs of his cauſe, than deſerve the the Regard of any ſober Perſon.

His talk about the Impoſſibility of Union between the Church of England, *and the Diſſenter, becauſe of the many Important Differences there are among*

our

our ſelves, is confuted by the Preſent Union of the Authours of the Enſuing Treatices, who, though they differ in little things as much as any, the One being a Confor. the other a Nonconformiſt; the third of a Uniting Spirit in the middle between us both, yet are we all heartily agreed in the things that would Unite us. Moreover it were eaſy to make it appear that the differences among the Diſſenters in General about Worſhip and Diſcipline are rather Nominal *than* Real, *and that their Union is in a manner already accompliſh'd.*

The Notions we inſiſt on in oppoſing the Deans Subſtitute are truly Proteſtant, ſuch as are owned and embraced by the Famous Hooker, *Dr.* Feild. *Mr.* Chilliggworth *and Dr.* Burnet, *and after a Signal manner by the Country Conformiſt, who hath expreſt himſelf in theſe Sheets with Gravity and Candor. He is aware of the deſign of this Author as well as we, as its Tendencie is towards* Rome, *and is ſenſible, that the methods taken in the oppoſition ſome of the Clergy make againſt the Peaceable Diſſenter, do Juſtifie the French in their Rigorous and moſt cruel Perſecutions.*

There is to the letter of Mr. Humfrey *to me at the end, his late* Paper *added Entitled* Materials for Union, *which together with this Preface if we offer'd no more will prove the things I have ſaid to be Feaſible, and alone ſerve to that Firm and Laſting Union, which is chiefly aim'd at in theſe our joint endeavours.*

To conclude, The peace of the Church of England, *and the Greatneſs of the King who is head of it, being things moſt deſireable to every good Proteſtant and true Subject, we have in theſe Papers ſhewn our good will to doe ſomething towards the advance thereof: Which being ſubmitted to the Superiour thoughts of ſome one who is in a higher Sphere of Ability for the cultivation of it, and of place for the repreſenting it without prejudice to our Sovereign, we do hope it may both be well accepted by him, and take with every body elſe, who do* truly *honour the King, ſeek Concord, and love good men.*

Sep. 16. 1681. Stephen Lobb.

The Author not being able to attend the Preſs deſires the Candid Reader before he peruſes the enſuing Diſcourſe to Correct theſe momentous Errata.

Pag. 11. l. 9. r. is to have a Right. p. 17. l. 14. *dele* them. p. 29. l. 38. for chain r. chair. p. 36. l. 37. for Catholick Colledge, r. Supream Governing Heads p. 74. before l. 18. r. Ple now conſider the Deans third Argument, which is p. 76. before l. 4. r. The Deans fourth Argument, which at this time only deſerves Animadverſions is, our Diviſions give great Advantage to the Papiſts, and the Diſſenters by their Separation have cauſed the Deviſion. Rep. p. *ib.* l. 5. for the 2. r. 2d. the l. 7. r. not. p. 78. l. 28. for Form r. Term.

A Reply to the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Unreasonableness, &c.

CHAP. I.

A Reply to the Reflections on the Title of the Enquiry.

SECT. I.

The Introduction. The Acts of the Enquirers pretended Immodesty Examined. The Dissenter vindicated from the Reproach of ruining King and Kingdom. The Civil War the product of Jesuitical *Councels, as is confess'd by Dr.* Heylin. *The War begun by the* Episcopal *on both sides. The tendency of the* Deans *Defence towards* Popery, *as 'tis a revival of the* Grotian *Design.*

THE Defence of the Reverend *Dean* of *Pauls* Unreasonableness of Separation, containing little in it of Argument, more than what we find in the Dean's own *Treatise*, might pass unanswered, had not the *Author*, by a fuller Discovery of the *Design* of his Party (which are but a few) made it necessary to shew to the world, whither it leads. For in this *Defence* there are hints enough given to tempt an Unprejudiced and Impartial *Reader* to fear, he hath engag'd himself too deeply in that Design that was seemingly but begun by the *Dean*. For which Reason I will in this, with as much modesty as the subject-matter will admit, and this Author will let me enjoy, shew, That as I did not *abuse* the *Dean* of *Pauls*, when in the *Modest and peaceable Enquiry*, I detected some of his *Mistakes*; even so, if we must pass a Judgment on the Doctor, answerable to the Character that is to be found of his Substitute in the Defence, 'tis apparent that they are conspiring in a Design, which the Learned and Conformable Clergy will give him little thanks for.

The Doctor's Substitute (as hereafter I will from his own words prove) doth sufficiently declare what his party would be at, which is a point, I'm sure, that will meet with opposition from such as are true Sons of the Church, whereby the *Controversie*, if closely followed, must cease to be between *Conformist* and *Noncormist*; it must be between *Conformist* and *Conformist*. It looks as if there were among our Church-men some resolv'd to revive *Laud*'s Design, as 'tis well known there are many others among them who highly value the *Principles* and *Temper* of that great Protestant Prelate *Abbot*, *Laud*'s Predecessor in the See of *Canterbury*, between whom the Scuffle must at last end.

That this may with the greater Conviction be evinc'd, I will in this Reply to the Defence of the Dean, *&c.* confine my self to the Author's own words, as compared with what is more than suggested in the Writings of Bishop *Bramhall*, and some other Sons of the Church of *England*; the which with due clearness I shall not be able to compass, if I follow our Author in his *disorderly* way of Writing. For which reason I must keep to the Method I took in the *Modest and Peaceable Enquiry*, and bring what calls for my observation, into its proper place. The whole then he hath offered in Answer to the *Enquiry*, may be reduced to these Heads.

1. His Reflections on the Title of the Enquiry.
2. His Censure of the Author's Design.
3. The Defence of the Dean.

I'll begin with the First.

The Author reflects on the *Title*, as if the Discourse, notwithstanding the specious pretences of the *Title*, had not been as *Modest*, nor as *Peaceable* as suggested; in doing which, he spends one whole Chapter, it may be not trifling matter enough in the *Discourse* it self, to enlarge so far, as to write any thing that might deserve the name of an Answer, or countenance the Title given his *Great Book*.

I could very easily therefore, as one unconcern'd, pass by *this first Chapter*, if there had not been more in it than the representing me as a person who deserve not the Character of being either *Modest* or *Peaceable*. But the Overt acts of Immodesty, which are insisted on by this Author, being such as cannot but be of an *ill Tendency*, I must consider 'em.

The

The firſt inſtance of Immodeſty is thus expreſs'd, "He begins "his Epiſtle to the Dean, with obſerving how induſtrious the Pa- "piſts have been, ever ſince the Reformation, to ruine *England* "and the Churches of Chriſt in it, which he ſufficiently proves "from their *Rebellions* and *Inſurrections* in King *Edward*'s days, "the *Spaniſh Armado* in Queen *Elizabeths*, the *Gun-Powder Trea-* "*ſon* in King *James*'s, &c. and the late *Helliſh Conſpiracy*, which "was deſigned for the utter Extirpation of the Proteſtant Reli- "gion, and the univerſal Deſtruction of all the Profeſſors there- "of, whether Epiſcopal or Diſſenter. *But this modeſt man* (ſaies "our Author) *takes no notice, That King and Kingdom, Church* "*and State have been once ruined already by ſuch* Modeſt Diſſen- "ters, *and may be in a fair way for it again, if we ſuffer our ſelves* "*to be* Charmed and Lulled aſleep *by ſuch modeſt Inquirers:* We "are aware, Sir, what a *Popiſh* Zeal *would* do, and what a "*Factious* Zeal *has* done; and think our ſelves concern'd, *as* "*much as we can, to countermine the Deſigns of both.* But however, "I confeſs it was very modeſtly done to paſs over this, that while "men are zealous againſt Popery, they may fear no danger "from any other quarter.

Rep. Whether the mentioning the *Rebellions* and *Inſurrections of the Papiſts* in King *Edw.* the 6th days, the *Spaniſh Armado* in Queen *Elizabeths*, the *Gunpowder-Treaſon* in King *James*'s, the *Helliſh Plot* of late diſcovered, be an extraordinary act of Immodeſty, or Unpeaceableneſs, let any *temperate man* among the Church of *England* judge that pleaſe. Is it an Act of *Immodeſty* to relate ſuch notorious Truths? or of *Unpeaceableneſs*, to mention the Dangers we are in, on the account of *Popiſh* bloody Plots? This it may be is not the Crime, but what follows, which is,

This modeſt man (ſaith our Author) *takes no notice, That King and Kingdom, Church and State, have been once ruin'd already by ſuch* modeſt Diſſenters, *and may be in a fair way for it again, if we ſuffer our ſelves to be* Charm'd and Lull'd aſleep *by ſuch Mo-deſt Inquirers.*

Rep. Hereby we know what the Authour would be at; 'tis as if he had ſaid, This *Modeſt Enquirer* is very immodeſt and quar-relſome, for not imitating the *Jeſuitical Clubs*, who are, con-trary to the *Act of Oblivion*, raking in old ſores, calling us to

the remembrance of 41. to make us look back on the actings of Archb. *Laud* and his *Faction*, the steps they made towards *Rome*, the bones of contention they cast in between a *Protestant Prince*, and a *Church of* England *Parliament*; the Civil War begun by the *Episcopal*, who were *Chief* in each Army. 'Twas this the *Enquirer* indeed past over in silence, wishing with his very Soul, that the *Episcopal Clergy* had been either so wise or honest as to have done their utmost to have prevented those Ruins, which their own Divisions brought on these Nations. For 'tis well known to many hundreds now alive, who they were that had an Influence on those Unnatural Broils and Intestine Quarrels; and whoever will consult Mr. *Baxter* against *Hinckley*, or rather Mr. *Rushworth*, and Dr. *Heylin*, will see, *That the Sons of the Church of* England *were on both sides the active persons concern'd in the very beginning of those Troubles.* But those things the *Inquirer* was loath to mention, it being as Unnecessary, as Unsuitable to his *Peaceable* Design.

However, seeing our *Author* will not be satisfied, unless some notice be taken of those that once already *Ruin'd King and Kingdom*, &c. I will out of Dr. *Heylin*'s Life of *Laud*, a good Record, at least in the sense of the *Dean*'s *Defender*, shew, who they were that did it. In a perusal of which 'twill appear, That 'twas the *Papists*, who had a *sole hand* in the *Plot*; no *Protestant*, I verily believe, ever design'd what was the unhappy product of the Hellish Conspiracies of the bloody *Papist*. This hath been long ago discover'd by Dr. *Du Moulin*, and since by Dr. *Oates*, and here most exactly related by Dr. *Heylin* a Son of the Church, in these words, *viz.* 'A Confederacy was formed amongst them, [*i. e.* the 'Papists] consisting of some of the most subtle heads in the 'whole *Jesuitical* Party; by whom it was concluded to foment 'the Broils began in *Scotland*, and to heighten the Combustions 'there, that the *King* being drawn into a War, might give them 'the opportunity to effect their Enterprize, for sending *Him* and 'the Archbishop to the other *World*. Which being by one of 'the party on *Compunction of Conscience* made known to *Andreas* 'ab Habernsfield, who had been Chaplain, as some said, to the 'Queen of *Bohemia*, they both together gave intimation of it to 'Sir *William Boswell*, his Majesties *Resident* at the *Hague*; having

'first

'first bound him by his *Oath*, not to reveal the ſame to any man 'living, but to the *Archbiſhop* himſelf, and by the *Archbiſhop* to 'the *King*. This ſignified by *Boſwell*'s Letters of the 19th of '*Septemb.* together with a general draught of the Deſign tranſ-'mitted to *Canterbury* under the hand of *Habernsfield* himſelf, the 'firſt Diſcoverer of the Plot: On the receipt of which Diſpatches, 'the *Archbiſhop* giving directions to *Boſwell* to proceed to a fur-'ther diſcovery of it, ſends the Intelligence with all ſpeed ima-'ginable, by his Letters of the 11th of the ſame Month, to the '*King* at *York*, beſeeching nothing more than his Secrecy in it, 'that he would not truſt his Pockets with thoſe dangerous Pa-'pers, and the buſineſs. And ſo far both the *King* and he had 'very good reaſon to be ſenſible of the Dangers which were 'threatned to them. But when the large Diſcovery was brought 'unto him, tranſmitted in *Boſwell*'s Letter of the 15th of *Octo-'ber*, he found ſome *Names* in it, which diſcredited the whole 'Relation, as well in his *Majeſties* judgment, as his own. For, 'beſides this naming of ſome profeſt *Papiſts*, as the Dutcheſs of '*Buckingham*, the Counteſſes of *Arundel* and *Newport*, *Montague*, '*Digby* and *Winter*, of whoſe Fidelity the King was not willing 'to have any *Suſpicion*, he named the Earl of *Arundel*, *Winde-'bank* Principal Secretary of State, and *Porter* one of the Grooms 'of the Bed-chamber, whom he charged to be the King's utter 'Enemies, and ſuch as betrayed his Secrets to the Popes *Nuncio* 'upon all occaſions; all which his *Majeſty* beheld as men of 'moſt approved *Loyalty* and *Affections* to him, by reaſon where-'of no *further credit being given to the Advertiſement* which they 'had from *Boſwell*, the danger, *ſo much feared at firſt*, *became* '*more ſlighted and neglected, than conſiſted with his Majeſties Safety*, 'and the condition of the times, which were apt to miſchief. 'For, though the Party, who firſt brake the Ice to this Intel-'ligence, might be miſtaken in the *Names* of ſome of the *Ac-'complices*, which were intereſſed in the Deſign, whoſe relations 'unto thoſe of the Church of *Rome* might give ſome ground for 'the miſtake; yet the *Calamities*, which ſoon after fell upon 'them both, the *deplorable Death* of the Archbiſhop firſt, and his '*Majeſty* afterwards, declare ſufficiently, *That there was ſome* '*greater reality in the Plot, than ſome were willing to believe.* But it

'had

'it had been a *Maxime* with King *James*, his Father, That *Su-*
'*ſpicion was the Sickneſs and Diſeaſe of a Tyrant*, which laid him
'open to all the ſubtle practices of malicious cunning. And it
'had been taken up by this *King* for an *Axiom* alſo, *That it was*
'*better to be Deceived than to Diſtruſt*; *which paved a plain and*
'*eaſie way to all thoſe Misfortunes, which in the whole courſe of his*
'*Reign, eſpecially for ten years laſt paſt, had been brought upon him.*
So far *Heylin.*

By this 'tis evident, That the *Papiſts* were the *firſt Contrivers* of all that ruine which befel the King and Kingdom, Church and State; and that the *firſt* who received any impreſſions from their wretched Attempts, were the *Sons of the Church*, is as evident to ſuch as conſult *Baxter*, *Ruſhworth*, &c. who it may be were ignorant of their Helliſh Deſigns; though 'tis evident enough that *Laud* was acquainted with them: For which reaſon it ſeems ſomewhat ſurprizing, that notwithſtanding his being ſo fully enlightned concerning it, he ſtill inclin'd to favour the *Papiſt* more than the *Puritan*, concerning which party, they had nothing but their ungrounded Surmiſes to occaſion any ill thoughts of 'em. For in the whole account *Heylin* gives of *their Eſſays*, I find nothing but intimations of their *Secret* actings, which 'tis like were ſo ſecret, that not one Overt Act can be given before there was an open breach between *King* and *Parliament*; at which time the *Papiſts* come in as *Auxiliaries* to the *King*, and the *Puritan* Party came in as ſuch to the *Parliament*: the King remaining to the very Death a Reſolved *Proteſtant*, which animated the *Papiſt* to do their utmoſt for his Ruine; in which after they had in part accompliſhed their *Deviliſh Deſign*, they ſtrangely triumph'd. I queſtion not but that many of the *Roman* Faction were in both Armies, in the one *Openly*, in the other under a *Covert*; and that they attempted to heighten the Diviſion; and at length turn'd all things into Confuſion. This I take to be a true account of the Tranſaction; but why our *Churchmen* ſhould thus glory, as if they had no hand in it, is not eaſie to conjecture: Neither is it over-eaſie to imagine, what the reaſon is, that our Author ſhould repreſent the *Papiſt* ſo favourably, even when his Diſcourſe againſt the *Diſſenters* is ſo *Invective*. For ſaith he,

We

We are aware, Sir, what a Popiſh Zeal would do, and what a Factious Zeal has done, &c. *q. d.* We are aware of what the *Papiſts would* do, not what they *have* done. What the *Papiſts* have done muſt not be mention'd, not one word of that: Not one word of their *old Rebellions* and *Inſurrections*; not one word of the *Gunpowder* Plot; not one word of the *Plot diſcover'd* by *Andreas ab Habernsfield*; not one word of the *Murder* of Sir *Edmundbury Godfrey*, of the Aſſaſſination of Juſtice *Arnold*; not one word of what they *have* done, only what they *would* do. A pleaſant Inſinuation, as if the *Papiſt* never yet diſcover'd by any Overt-acts their Horrid Deſign, *&c.* 'Tis the Factious Zeal only which *has* done ſomewhat. But yet this is not to prepare the people to expect a *Presbyterian Plot*, when there is none among Proteſtants, but what is carried on by the *Sons of the Church*: This is not to act ſuitable to the *Popiſh Deſigns*, which were to deſtroy the *King*, after they had prepar'd the People to believe the *Presbyterians* were Reſolv'd for it. Whether this was the *Dean*'s Deſign in miſrepreſenting *Diſſenters*, I could not tell; but as to *your ſelf*, I muſt ſay, That whatever your Deſign is, if you had been hir'd by a *Popiſh Plotter*, you could not more effectually do his work for him; and that the *Proteſtant Gentry*, who mind the *Subſtantial part* of their Religion, more than an *indifferent Rite*, cannot but deeply reſent theſe your Proceedings.

Is it not moſt obvious, that notwithſtanding the loud Cries we have had of the *Factious and Seditious Principles of Diſſenters*, the Diſſenters have approved themſelves, when under the ſevereſt Cenſures and Preſſures of our *Clergy*, to be men of another Character? That notwithſtanding the many *Prophetical* and *Hiſtorical* Diſcourſes among our *Church-men* of a *Presbyterian Plot*, no ſuch thing could be faſtned on a *Proteſtant Diſſenter*; the Deſign of the *Papiſts* being the real Deſtruction of hearty *Proteſtants*, though Sons of the Church, under the name of *Presbyterians*? Read Mr. *Dangerfield*'s Diſcovery of that *Sham-Presbyterian Plot*, and you'll find My Lord Duke of *Monmouth*, the Lord *Preſident*, the Lord of *Eſſex*, brought in by the *Papiſts* as *Presbyterian Plotters*: Although 'tis well known, that they are Sons of the Church of *England*, whoſe Loyalty to their Prince,

and

and Firmneſs to the Proteſtant Religion, doth equalize the greatneſs of their Honour.

Methinks, Sir, 'tis now high time to conſider, That *as* all Proteſtants, whether *Epiſcopal*, *Presbyterian*, or *Congregational*, &c. are all in one bottom, even *ſo* the One cannot be ruin'd with the preſervation of the Other. Ought we not then to entertain better thoughts of each other? What, ſhall we now quarrel with one another, even when, unleſs we joyn in putting our hand to the Pump, the Ship ſinks, and we all muſt periſh together? But I muſt not enlarge on this ſubject, leſt I be thought too Immodeſt and Unpeaceable.

A Second Inſtance of Immodeſty now ſucceeds; *'Twas modeſtly done* (ſaith the Author) *to charge the* Dean *with a Deſign of gratifying the* Roman *Faction*, &c. *And at the ſame time to laugh at the* Jeſuits *and* Coleman *as great Fools, for deſigning to bring in* Popery, *by the Tolerating* Fanaticks.

Rep. How is this that our Author treats the *Dean* ſo unmannerly, as to joyn him thus with the *Jeſuits* and *Coleman!* Methinks a defending the *Dean* ſhould be a diſtinct work from a *vindicating* the reputation of *Jeſuits*, and the Traitor *Coleman*. And why, Sir, may I not laugh at the Counſels of ſome *Jeſuits*, without being immodeſt to the Doctor? Have you ſuch venerable thoughts of theſe men, that a laughing at their Devices is a Crime that muſt not paſs without Rebuke?

But the *Dean* is repreſented as a *Reviler* of *Diſſenters*, and that's immodeſt.

Rep. What I ſuggeſted as to this, was not without great reaſon, as may appear from what I inſiſted on in the *Enquiry*; but he goes on very pleaſantly, as if by *Reviling* Diſſenters I meant *Confuting* Diſſenters. Really Sir, if by Reviling Diſſenters I meant a Confuting of them, I fear I ſhould have wronged the Doctor and the Truth alſo, if I had but ſaid there was any one Reviling paſſage in the whole Treatiſe; but the fixing this ſenſe on the words, to the end you may give us an account of your *admirable Faculty* of Talking very little to the purpoſe, is an excellency wherein you ſeem to delight; for I'm ſure you are ſo modeſt as to faſten your own, which is a foreign ſenſe on my words, and then run on triumphantly, *&c.* but after ſo eaſie a manner,

manner, that it deſerves not an Anſwer; and therefore I'll conſider the great thing.

The Doctor is brought in (you ſay) as one deſigning to *Gratifie the Roman Faction.*

Rep. That I might prevent any juſt offence here, I was expreſs in diſtinguiſhing between the *Deans* own intent, and tendency of his *Treatiſe.* Take my words in the *Enquiry*, 'I will propoſe the 'Deſign of the Dr's *Hiſtory*, [*(i. e.)* of that account he had given 'of Diſſenters, *&c.*] being charitably diſpos'd to diſtinguiſh be-'tween the *Finis Operis*, and *Operantis*; For though the *End* of the work it ſelf cannot but in its tendency prove pernicious to the Proteſtant Religion, yet *I hope the Dr. deſign'd it not as ſuch.*

But though I thought my ſelf oblig'd to be thus civil in my thoughts of the *Reverend Dean*, I do not find any Reaſon to paſs the ſame favourable Cenſure on you. The Dr. I knew wrote againſt the *Papiſts*; but whether you have not in ſome *Treatiſes* formerly done as much in ſome reſpects for 'em, is beſt known to your ſelf. Whatever you have done either for or againſt the *Papiſt* formerly, by what I find in your *Defence* of the Dean, I do very much ſuſpect you. 'Tis very evident, you have in your *Notions* about the *Nature* of an *Univerſal Church*, the *Notion of Schiſm*, &c. faln in with thoſe that were not aſhamed to own, that they were for a going towards *Rome*, in order to an accommodating the Differences between the *Church* of *England*, and the *Papiſt.*

That this may appear to be ſo, I will faithfully ſet down your notion of theſe things, and then compare it with the Deſign of Archb. *Laud* and Archb. *Bramhall*, and leave it to the judgment of the Candid and Impartial Reader, whether you are not of thoſe who ran the *Caſſandrian way.* You ſay,

§ 1. That the *Catholique Church* conſiſts of ſuch Particular Churches, as have all the Eſſentials of *a* Church, as to Faith, Government, and Diſcipline. It conſiſts of all theſe, as Similar parts, which have the ſame Nature, and make up one Body by a common Union. This *p.* 139, 140.

§ 2. That the *Catholique Church*, though it conſiſts of all Particular Churches contained in it, yet 'tis not a meer arbitrary combination and confederacy of particular Churches; but is

the *Root and Fountain of Unity*, and *in order of nature antecedent to particular Churches*, as the Sun is before its Beams, and the Root before its Branches. So that all Particular Churches received their denomination of *Catholique Church* from the *Catholique Church*, p. 144, *&c.*

Here you aſſert, That *the Univerſal Church is in order of nature antecedent to Particular Churches, as the Sun is before its Beams, and the Root before its Branches*, &c. But your Alluſion is not *ad rem*; for you ſhould have given us ſome inſtance of ſome one Univerſal, that was in order of nature antecedent to its Particulars, which is impoſſible; it being, in the ſenſe of moſt, evident, That *Univerſale* is *unum in multis*, that is, *in many particulars*, which Univerſal hath no real Exiſtence, but in Particulars; for abſtracted from all Particulars, 'tis only an *Ens rationis*, having its being in the *Eutopian Commonwealth*; whence we diſtinguiſh between the conſideration of an *Univerſal* as *Formal*, and as *Fundamental*. *Fundamentally*, and 'tis *quid ſingulare*; but *Formally*, and ſo 'tis abſtracted from all Singulars; the Particulars being the foundation of the Univerſal, the Root from which the Univerſal doth proceed. Now if it be the Particulars that are the foundation of the Univerſal, How can the Univerſal be the Root of the Particulars? This is the more remarkable in our Author, becauſe he falls in with an old exploded part of *Independency*, viz. *That what perſon ſoever is not a Member of a Particular Church, is not ſo of the Univerſal Church.* Which being ſo, I would fain know Where this Univerſal Church ſhould be, when Antecedent to any Particular Church? If he had ſaid, That by a *Particular Church*, he meant only ſuch as were Organiz'd and faln into ſome compleat order; and that there were many, who not having arriv'd to that degree of being compleat Church-members of any Particular Church, who yet were Members of the Church Univerſal; he would have had ground for his Aſſertion; for there muſt be Particular Chriſtians before Particular Churches: but to adhere to his *Hypotheſis*, which ſeems to be but a ſtep to the aſſerting *Dioceſan Churches* to be in order of nature antecedent to particular Congregations, is ridiculous; eſpecially ſeeing he aſſerts, That the Univerſal Church is an *Organiz'd*, or *Political* Body, the πρῶτον διαιτητὸν of all Inſtituted Worſhip and

and Diſcipline; as if there could be Church-Members under Government, antecedent to the being of Particular Churches, even when no one that is not a Member of a Particular Church, is a Member of the Uniuerſal: As if a City that conſiſts of many particular Houſes were in order of nature antecedent to every particular Houſe.

§ 3. That the *Unity* of the *Chriſtian Church* conſiſts in one *Communion. Catholique Unity* ſignifies *Catholique Communion.* To have a Right to be a Member of the *Chriſtian Church*, to communicate in all the ſeveral Duties and Offices of Religion with all Chriſtians all the World over, and to partake in all the Priviledges of Chriſtians, and to be admitted to the freedom of their converſation, to *eat*, and *drink*, and *diſcourſe*, and *trade together.* So that ſuch as are not *Church-Members* have no right to trade among Chriſtians; A pleaſant Inſinuation!

§ 4. The *Unity of the Chriſtian Sacraments*, viz. *Baptiſm and the Lords-Supper*, prove the Unity of Chriſtian Communion. This is from *p.* 193. to *p.* 208.

§ 5. *Unity of Church-Power and Government*, doth alſo prove the Unity of Chriſtian Communion. Under this head he maintains;

1. That every *Biſhop*, *Presbyter*, or *Deacon*, by his Ordination is made a Miniſter of the *Catholique Church*; though for the better edification of the Church, the exerciſe of his Office is more peculiarly confin'd to ſome particular place.

2. Every *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* receives into the *Catholique Church* by *Baptiſm*, and ſhuts out of the *Catholique Church* by *Excommunication.*

3. *That the Catholique Church is united and coupled by the cement of Biſhops, who ſtick cloſe together*; for which you produce *Cyprian.*

4. That the Unity and Peace of the *Epiſcopacy* is maintained by their governing their Churches by *mutual Conſent.* Whence you mention the *Collegium Epiſcopale*, the *Epiſcopal Colledge*, which I take to be a *Council of Biſhops*, which Biſhops have an Original Right and Power in relation to the *whole Church*, (i. e.) *the foreign Biſhops*, as thoſe of *Alexandria* and *Rome*, &c. have an *Original Power* and *Right* in relation to the whole Church,

even a Right and Power in relation to *England*.

5. That every *part* of the *Universal Church is under the Government of the Universal Bishops assembled in their Colledge*, or *in Council*; and what Bishop soever abuse his Power, he shall be accountable to those assembled in *Council*.

6. That there is no such thing as the *Independency of Bishops*, their Independency being almost as inconsistent with Ecclesiastical Unity, as the Indpendency of single Congregations. Whence the *Church* of *England*, called either *Archi-Episcopal*, *National*, or *Patriarchal*, is not *Independent*, but accountable unto *Foreign* Bishops, if at any time they abuse their Power.

7. That this Council of Forreign Bishops, unto which they are accountable, must look on the Bishop of *Rome* as their *Primate*; the *Primacy* of the Bishop of *Rome* being acknowledged, it seems, by our Author himself, as well as by *Bramhall*. The *Primacy* (he saith) out of *Cyprian*, being given to *Peter*, that it might appear, that the *Church* of *Christ* was *One*; and the *Chair*, that is, the Apostolical Office and Power, is *One*. Thus *Cyprian*, on whom lay all the care of the Churches, dispatches Letters to *Rome*, from whence they were sent through all the *Catholique Churches*. All this is to be found from *p.* 208 to the end of the Chapter. Thus you agree with *Bramhall*, though you express not the Notion so well as he doth, and should learn it better.

Before I proceed therefore, I cannot but desire you to consider what is become of your *Protestant Episcopacy*; I beseech you, Sir, consider, Is the *French Episcopacy*, a *Protestant Episcopacy*? If not, seeing the *English* Episcopacy, as described by you, is the same with the *French*, Why call you the one a *Popish*, and the other a *Protestant* Episcopacy? Whether you agree not in these respects with the *Papists*, let the world judge.

But you go on to assert,

§ 6. That to be in *Communion* with any Church, is to be a Member of it, every Member having equal Right, and equal *Obligation* to all parts of *Christian* Communion, even that Communion which is *External* and *Visible*, p. 132, *&c.*

§ 7. All Christians being bound to communicate with that *part of the Catholique Church* wherein they *live*, are guilty of

Schism,

Schiſm, if they *ſeparate*; whoever ſeparate from ſuch *particular Churches* as are members of the *Catholick Church*, do ſeparate from the *Univerſal Catholick Church*, which is *Schiſm*. For to divide from any part of the *Catholick Church*, is to break *Catholick communion*, i.e. to be a *Schiſmatick*. Whence 'tis concluded,

1. That *Schiſm* is a ſeparating from the *Catholick Church*, which notion taken ſingly, will ſtand the Diſſenters and all true Chriſtians who muſt be acknowledged to be members of the Catholick Church, in great ſtead, freeing them from the odious ſin of *Schiſm*. The *Diſſenters* divide not themſelves from the communion of the Univerſal Church, *Ergo*, not *Schiſmaticks*. But the miſchief is, that as this notion of *Schiſm* which our Author adheres unto, is the ſame with that of the *Papiſts*, as is to be ſeen in *Filiucius*, *Azorius*, &c. but in an eſpecial manner in *Charity maintain'd by Catholicks*; even ſo he cloſes with the ſame Popiſh Faction, in aſſerting,

2. That *ſeparating* from the *Church of England* is a *ſeparating from the Catholick Church*, as if the *Catholick Church* had been as much confin'd within the bounds of the *Church of England*, as the *Papiſts* ſay within the *limits of Rome*. Whence whoever ſeparates from the *Church of England*, cuts *himſelf from the Catholick Church, puts himſelf out of a ſtate of ſalvation*; He is *extra Eccleſiam, extra quam nulla ſalus*; they are all, while *Schiſmaticks*, in a ſtate of damnation. But ſurely if theſe men believed ſo much, methinks they ſhould not be at reſt until all their unſcriptural impoſitions were removed, unleſs they have greater kindneſs for ſuch *trifles*, than they have for ſuch *immortal ſouls* for whom Chriſt dyed.

By this Doctrine we may underſtand why 'tis that ſome of our *Clergy* ſhew greater tenderneſs towards *Drunkards*, *Swearers*, *Papiſts*, than towards *poor Diſſenters*: The former may hold communion with the *Church of England*, and conſequently with the *Catholick Church*; when the others are *undoubtedly* in a ſtate of *damnation*; as if we were all in the ſame ſtate with Hereticks.

I'le not (as eaſily I might) now enlarge, in ſhewing the weakneſs which the Dean's Subſtitute hath diſcovered in the management of this *Grotian* or *Caſſandrian Deſign*; but only tell him, That if he had conſulted that excellent Treatiſe *The Grotian Religion diſcovered*, by Mr. *Baxter*, he might have ſeen an unanſwer-

anſwerable confutation of a great part of his Book; or if he had rather applied himſelf unto that great Prelate Biſhop *Bramhall*, a man of *extraordinary worth* for his Learning, he might have better digeſted his Notion: For there he would have been furniſhed with ſuch diſtinctions about *Communion*, that would have been for his purpoſe and rectification. In his Defence of the *Church of England*, *Tom.* 2. *Diſp.* 2. c. 2. he ſaith, *The Communion of the Chriſtian Catholick Church*, is partly *internal*, partly *external*. Among many other things, in diſcourſing of internal communion, 'tis added, That it is *to judg charitably one of another. To exclude none from the Catholick Communion and hope of ſalvation, either Eaſtern, or Weſtern, or Southern, or Northern Chriſtians, which profeſs the ancient Faith of the Apoſtles and primitive Fathers, eſtabliſhed in the firſt General Councils, and comprehended in the Apoſtolick, Nicene, and Athanaſian Creeds.* This granted by our Author, as deſcrib'd by *Bramhall*, ſeeing the Faith contain'd in theſe *Creeds* is profeſſed by the *Diſſenters*, 'tis queried, Whether or no this *Gentleman* doth not fall ſhort in this reſpect of *Catholick internal communion*, by excluding the Diſſenters from the *Catholick communion* and *hope of ſalvation*? Moreover as to *external communion*, ſays *Bramhall*, There are degrees of *excluſion*; every one that is excluded, is not *cut off from the Catholick Church*; for external communion may ſometimes be ſuſpended more or leſs, by the juſt cenſures of the Church *clave non errante*, as in the *primitive times* ſome were excluded *a cætu participantium*, only from the uſe of the Sacraments; others *a cætu procumbentium*, from Sacraments and Prayers alſo; and others *a cætu Audientium*, from Sacraments, Prayers, and Sermons; and others *a cætu Fidelium*, from the ſociety of Chriſtians, yea and as it may be ſuſpended, it may be waved, or withdrawn by *particular Churches* or *perſons*, from their Neighbour Churches, or Chriſtians, in their Innovations or Errors. Nor is there *ſo ſtrict and perpetual an adherence required to a particular Church, as to the univerſal Church.* This ſurely is enough to intimate how ſudden our Authors thoughts were: for had he but *deliberated* on thoſe things as this great *Biſhop* did, he would not aſſert *ſo confidently*, That the *ſeparating from a particular Church that is in the Univerſal, is a ſeparating from the Univerſal.*

Leaving therefore our Author to receive further light from this Biſhop concerning his own notion; I'le make my addreſs to the

Reader

Reader, beſeeching him to apply himſelf to our Proteſtant Divines for an anſwer to what is ſaid againſt the *dependency* of the *Church of England on Foreign Churches*, ſuch as *Rome*, &c. And as to what he ſaith concerning *Schiſm* from the Univerſal Church, which p. 256. ſaith he, is *when any ſhall ſeparate from that part of the Catholick Church where they dwell, and ſet up any diſtinct Churches meerly for ſome greater degree of purity.* This is ſo like what the *Author* of *Charity maintain'd by Catholicks*, inſiſted on, that the *Memorandums* given by the famous Mr. *Chillingworth*, will be ſufficient to enable an ordinary capacity to anſwer the whole he hath aſſerted about *Schiſm*.

1. *That not every ſeparation*, but *a cauſleſs ſeparation from the* external communion *of any Church, is the ſin of* Schiſm.

2. *That impoſing upon men under pain of Excommunication, a neceſſity of profeſſing known errors, and practiſing known corruptions, is a ſufficient and neceſſary cauſe of ſeparation; and that this is the cauſe which Proteſtants alledg to juſtifie their ſeparation from the Church of Rome.* To which I muſt add, That this is the cauſe which Diſſenters alledg to juſtifie their ſeparation from the Church of *England*, it being uncontroulably true, That the profeſſing known errors, and the practiſing known corruptions, is impoſed on Diſſenters on *pain of Excommunication*, as hath been proved in Mr. *Baxter's firſt Plea for Peace*, never anſwered, but only nibled at by ſome inconſiderate Scriblers. The Diſſenters are convinc'd in conſcience, that if they continued in your communion, they ſhould ſin againſt God. What can be offered againſt this, I know not, unleſs you'l ſay unto us thus, viz. *If this your pretence of conſcience may ſerve, what Schiſmatick in the Church, what popular ſeditious brain in a Kingdom, may not alledg the dictamen of conſcience to free themſelves from Schiſm or Sedition? No man wiſhes them to do any thing againſt their conſciences; but we ſay that they may and ought to rectifie and depoſe ſuch a conſcience, which is eaſie for them to do.* This is what hath been frequently urg'd by the *Clergy*, yea by the Dean of *Pauls*. But ſeeing theſe words are taken out of the mouth of a *Papiſt*, the anſwer ſhall be no other than what I find in the mouth of a ſon of the Church, the famous *Chillingworth*, who aſſerts, *That whoever is convinced in conſcience, that the Church of* Rome *errs, cannot with a good conſcience but forſake her in the profeſſion and practice of her errors; and the reaſon hereof is manifeſt, becauſe otherwiſe he muſt profeſs what he believe,*

lieves not, and practice what he approves not; which is no more than your self in these *have divers times affirmed.* For *in one place* you say, 'tis *unlawful to speak any the least untruth.* Now *he that professes your Religion, and believes it not, what else doth he but live in a perpetual lye?* Again, in another, *you have called them that profess one thing, and believe another, a* damned crew of dissembling Sycophants. And therefore in inveighing against Protestants for forsaking the profession of those Errors, the belief whereof they had already forsaken, what do you but rail at them for not being a damned crew of Sycophants? [The same may be said as to the Dissenters who are in conscience convinced, that they must profess to believe what really they do not, should they conform]. But as to what the wicked may pretend as to conscience, take the Author's answer: *'Tis said that a pretence of conscience will not serve to justifie separation from being Schismatical; which is true, but little to the purpose,* (saith Mr. *Chil.*) *seeing it was but an erroneous persuasion, much less an* hypocritical *pretence, but a* true and well grounded conviction of conscience. *And therefore though seditious men in the Church and State, may pretend* conscience for a cloak of their Rebellion; *yet this I hope hinders not but that an honest man ought to obey his rightly informed conscience, rather than the unjust command of his Tyrannous Superiors. Otherwise with what colour can you defend either your own refusing the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy?* I may add, Otherwise with what colour can the Dean and his Substitute defend their so firmly adhering to the present Constitution?

But to return to the third *Memorandum.*

3. *That to leave the Church, and to leave the external communion of the Church at least, as Dr.* Potter *understands the words* (and I think I may safely add, as every Protestant but a *Grotian* understands) *is not the same thing. That being done by ceasing to be a member of it, by ceasing to have those requisites which constitute a man a member of it, as Faith and Obedience; This by refusing to communicate with any Church in her Liturgies and publick Worship of God. This little Armour, if it be rightly placed, I am persuaded will repel all those batteries which you threaten shall be so furious.* To use the words of Mr. *Chil.* And for this reason I will now shew the Reader,

That the *Model* the *Deans Substitute* hath given us, is what is not only in it self admirably adjusted to accommodate the difference

ferences between one Faction of the *Church* of *England*, and the *Church* [not the Court] of *Rome*, for that is their Diſtinction; but moreover 'tis very like that of Archb. *Laud*, for which he was cenſur'd as a Favourer of *Popery*.

This I will attempt to perform, by giving you an account of the Charge that was brought in againſt *Laud* in the Houſe of Commons by the Lord *Faulkland*, a true Son of the *Church*; and the Reply is made thereunto by Dr. *Heylin*, whereby 'twill appear, that as there is an agreement between *Laud*'s Deſign and our *Authors*, even ſo *this* as well as *that* was to bring the *Church* of *Rome* and *England* together.

§ 1. Take My Lord *Faulklkland*'s Speech made in the Houſe of Commons, as repreſented by Dr. *Heylin* in the Life of Archbiſhop *Laud*, p. 383. 'A little ſearch (ſaith he) will find 'them to have been the Deſtruction of *Unity*, under pretence 'of *Uniformity*; To have brought in *Superſtition* and *Scandal*, 'under titles of *Reverence* and *Decency*; to have defiled our '*Church*, by adorning our *Churches*; to have ſlackned the ſtrict-'neſs of that Union which was formerly between us and thoſe 'of our Religion beyond the Seas, an Action as unpolitick as 'ungodly: Or we ſhall find them to have reſembled rhe Dog 'in the Manger, to have neither Preached themſelves, nor ſuf-'fered thoſe that would; to have brought in Catechiſing, only 'to thruſt out Preaching; and cried down *Lecturers* by the 'names of *Factions*, either becauſe their Induſtry in that Duty 'appeared a reproof to their neglect of it; or with intention to 'have brought in Darkneſs, that they might the eaſier ſow their 'Tares while it was Night: And by that introduction of *Igno-'rance*, introduce the *beſter that Religion*, which *accounts it the 'Mother of Devotion*. In which (ſaith he) they have abuſed his '*Majeſty*, as well as his people; For when he had with great 'wiſdom ſilenced on both parts thoſe Opinions, which have often 'tormented the *Church*, and have and always will trouble the '*Schools*, they made uſe of this Declaration to tye up one ſide, 'and to let the other looſe: Whereas they ought either in diſcre-'tion to have been equally reſtrained, or in Juſtice to have 'been equally tolerated. And 'tis obſervable, that the party to 'which they gave this Licence, was that, whoſe Doctrine, 'though it was not contrary to Law, was contrary to Cuſtom; 'and for a long time in this Kingdom was no oftner Preached,

'than recanted, &c. We find them introducing such Doctrines, 'as admitting them to be true, the *truth* could not *recompence* 'the *Scandal*; or such as were so far false, as Sir *Thomas Moore* 'says of the *Casuists*, their business was not to keep men from 'sinning, but to inform them, *Quàm prope ad peccatum sine pec-* 'cato liceat accedere. So it seemed their work was to try, how 'much of *a Papist might be brought in without Popery*; and to de- 'stroy as much of the *Gospel*, without bringing themselves into 'danger of being destroyed by *Law*. To go yet further, some 'of them have so industriously laboured to deduce themseves 'from *Rome*, that they have given great suspicion that in Gra- 'titude they desire to return thither, or *at least to meet it half* 'way; Some have evidently laboured to bring in an *English*, 'though not a *Roman Popery*. I mean, not only the *outside* and 'dress of it, but *equally absolute, a blind dependence of the People* 'upon the Clergy, and of the Clergy upon themselves: And have 'opposed the *Papacy* beyond the Seas, that they might *settle one* 'beyond the Water.

§ 2. I'll now proceed to the Reply Dr. *Heylin* makes to this Speech of the Lord *Faulkland*.

1. He produces the several Protestations of the *Archbishop* made in the *Starchamber*, [p. 389, 390, &c.] and at his *Tryal* before the Lords; and on the Scaffold just before his going out of this world, of his *Innocency* as to this. Besides, Dr. *Heylin* doth insist on his Conference with *Fisher* the Jesuit, the enlarging that Conference as an Argument that the *Archbishop* was no *Papist*.

2. Touching the *Design of working a Reconciliation* betwixt *us* and *Rome*, 'tis acknowledged by *Heylin*, and the Design applauded. Take his own words, 'I thought when our Saviour 'said *Beati Pacifici*, it had been sufficient warrant to any man to 'endeavour Peace, to build up the Breaches in the *Church*, and 'to make *Jerusalem like a City, which is at Unity in it self*, espe- 'cially where it may be done not only *Salvâ Charitate*, without 'breach of Charity; but *Salvâ Fide* too, without wrong to 'Faith. The greatest part of the Controversies between us and 'the *Church* of *Rome* not being in the *Fundamentals*, or in any 'Essential point in the Christian Religion, I cannot but look upon 'it as a most pious work, to endeavour an *Attonement* in the Su- 'perstructures. So far *Heylin* goes to shew both the *Lawfulness* of the endeavours of a Reconciliation, and then the *Possibility*

of

of obtaining of it. The which Dr. *Heylin* no ſooner evinces, but he admits that ſuch a *Reconciliation* was *endeavoured* betwixt the *Agents* for both Churches, and gives an hint upon what terms the Agreement was to have been made, and how far they proceeded on it.

3. 'As to Reconciliation (ſaith he out of a Book entituled the 'Pope's *Nuncio*, affirmed to have been written by a *Venetian* Am-'baſſador, at his being in *England*) between the Churches of 'England and *Rome*, there were made ſome General Propoſi-'tions and Overtures by the *Archbiſhops Agents*; they aſſuring, 'that his *Grace was very much diſpoſed thereunto*: And that if it 'was not accompliſh'd in his Life-time, it would prove a work 'of more difficulty after his Death. That in very truth, for the 'laſt *three years* the *Archbiſhop* had introduced ſome *Innovations, ap-'proaching near the Rites and Forms of* Rome: That the Biſhop 'of *Chicheſter*, a great Confident of his Grace, the Lord Trea-'ſurer, and eight other Biſhops of his Grace's party, did moſt 'paſſionately deſire a *Reconciliation* with the *Church* of *Rome*; that 'they did day by day recede from their antient Tenents, to *ac-'commodate with the Church of* Rome; that therefore the *Pope* 'ought on his part to make ſome ſteps to *meet* them, and the 'Court of *Rome* remit ſomething of its Rigour in Doctrine, or 'otherwiſe no accord will be. The *Compoſition* on both ſides 'was in ſo good a forwardneſs before *Panzany* left the Kingdom, 'that the *Archbiſhop* and *Biſhop* of *Chicheſter* had often ſaid, That 'there were but two ſorts of people likely to impede and hin-'der the Reconciliation; to wit, the *Puritans* amongſt the *Pro-'teſtants*, and the *Jeſuits* amongſt the *Catholiques*.

'Let us next ſee the judgment and relation of another Au-'thor, in a Gloſs or Comment on the former, entituled *The* 'Engliſh *Pope*, Printed at *London* in the ſame Year, 1643, and he 'will tell us, That after *Con* had undertook the managing of the 'Affairs, matters began to grow to ſome Agreement. The *King* 'Required, ſaith he, ſuch a Diſpenſation from the then Pope, as that 'his *Catholique* Subjects might reſort to the *Proteſtant* Churches, 'and to take the Oaths of Supremacy and Fidelity; and that 'the Pope's Juriſdiction here ſhould be declared to be but of 'Humane Right. And ſo far had the *Pope* conſented, that what-'ever did concern the King therein, ſhould have been really 'performed, ſo far as other *Catholick Princes* uſually enjoy and

'expect as their due: And so far as the Bishops were to be *Independent both from King and Pope*, there was no fear of breach on the Pope's part. So that upon the point, the Pope was to content himself amongst us in *England* with *a Priority, instead of a Superiority* over other Bishops; and with *a Primacy* instead of *a Supremacy* in these Parts of Christendom, which I conceive no man of Learning and Sobriety would have grudged to grant him. It was also condescended to in the name of the *Pope*, that Marriage might be permitted to Priests; that the Communion might be administred *sub utraque specie*; and that the *Liturgy* might be officiated in the *English* Tongue. And though the *Author* adds not long after, that it was to be suspected, *That so far as the Inferiour Clergy and the People were concerned, the after performance was to be left to the Popes discretion*; yet this was but his own Suspicion, without ground at all. And to obtain a Reconciliation upon these advantages, *the Archbishop had all the reason in the world to do as he did, in ordering the Lords-Table to be placed where the Altar stood, and making the accustomed Reverence in all approaches towards it*, and accesses to it: In beautifying and adorning *Churches*, and celebrating the Divine Service with all due *Solemnities*; in taking care that all *offensive and exasperating passages* should be expunged out of such Books as were brought to the Press; and for reducing the extravagancy of some Opinions to an evener temper. His Majesty had the like Reason also for Tolerating lawful Recreations on Sundays and Holydays.

But the Doctor goes on, 'If you would know how far they had proceeded towards this *happy Reconciliation*, the *Popes Nuncio* will assure us thus, That the Universities, Bishops, and Divines of this Realm, *did daily embrace Catholick Opinions*, though they *professed not* so much with Pen, or Mouth, for fear of the *Puritans*. For example, *They hold that the Church of* Rome *is a true Church*; *That the Pope is Superiour to all Bishops*; *That to him it appertains to call* General Councils; *That 'tis lawful to pray for the Souls of the departed*; *That Altars ought to be erected of Stone*: In sum, *That they believe all that is taught by the* Church, *but not by the* Court *of* Rome. Another of their Authors tells us, (as was elsewhere noted) That those amongst us of greatest Worth, Learning, and Authority, began to love *Temper* and *Moderation*: That their Doctrines began to be al-

'tered

'tered in many things, for which their Progenitors forſook the 'Viſible Church of Chriſt; As for example, *The Pope not Anti-'chriſt, Prayers for the Dead, Limbus Patrum, Pictures; That the 'Church hath Authority in determining Controverſies of Faith,* and 'to interpret Scriptures about Free-will, Predeſtination, Uni-'verſal Grace; That all our Works are not Sins, Merit of good 'Works, Inherent Juſtice, Faith alone doth juſtifie, Charity *to 'be preferr'd before* Knowledg, the Authority of Traditions, 'Commandments poſſible to be kept: That in Expoſition of the 'Scripture, they are by Canon bound to follow the Fathers; 'And that the once fearful names of *Prieſts* and *Altars* are uſed '*willingly in their Talk and Writings.* In which compliances, ſo 'far forth as they ſpeak the Truth, ſaies *Heylin,* (for in ſome 'points, through the Ignorance of the One and the Malice of 'the Other, they are much miſtaken) there is *ſcarce any thing 'which may not very well conſiſt with the eſtabliſhed* (though for a 'time diſcontinued) Doctrine of the Church of *England.* The 'Articles whereof, as the ſame *Jeſuit* hath obſerved, ſeem *pa-'tient,* or *ambitious* rather of ſome *ſenſe* wherein they may ſeem 'Catholick. And ſuch a ſenſe is put upon them by him that calls himſelf *Franciſcus à Sancta Clara,* as before was ſaid. So far *Heylin.*

Thus to carry on this *Reconciling Deſign,* all the care imaginable muſt be taken to *humour the Papiſt,* not only by proſecuting the *Puritan* with the greateſt ſeverity; but the Pope muſt not any longer be ſtigmatized with the name of *Antichriſt*; all exaſperating paſſages in any Book brought to the Preſs, muſt be *expung'd,* not one word of the *Gunpowder-Treaſon*; for ſaid *Baker* the Biſhop of *London*'s chaplain, We are not now ſo angry with the *Papiſts,* as we were twenty years ago; and that there was no need to exaſperate them; and therefore the Book concerning the *Gunpowder-Treaſon,* muſt by no means be reprinted; the *Divine Service* muſt be in ſome reſpects altered; that whereas the *Reformers* in *Queen Elizabeth*'s time had a greater kindneſs for the Pope than thoſe in *H.* 8. and *Ed.* 6. manifeſted by expunging a clauſe againſt the *Pope,* viz. *From the tyranny of the Biſhop of* Rome, *and all his deteſtable enormities, Good Lord deliver us.* Even ſo in imitation, Archbiſhop *Laud* changes ſome phraſes in the Book of *Prayers for the fifth of November.* So far a Church of *England* Dr. To which I might add ſeveral other inſtances,

ſtances, but I wiſh there had not been the woful occaſion of inſiſting on ſo much.

By this time the *Reader* may ſee cauſe to ſuſpect at leaſt the *Deans Subſtitute*, who in the Defence of the Dr. gives us the *ſcheme* of the *old Grotian model*, ſo much eſteemed by the Archbiſhop *Laud*, who in his walking towards *Rome*, kept moſt exactly thereunto.

But notwithſtanding this, caution muſt be had, that we reproach not all the Church of *England* as if they had been ſuch as this Author; for I do verily believe there are very few this day in *England* among the Conforming Clergy, who will approve of this mans notion, but probably may judg themſelves as much concerned to oppoſe it, as any among the Diſſenters. I'm ſure *Abbot* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and *Uſher* Primate of *Ireland*, were perſons of quite another *principle* and *temper*.

And not only *Abbot* and *Uſher*, but if we may judg of a *Queen Elizabeth Proteſtant* by the Writings of the famous *Hooker* and Dr. *Field*, we may be ſure that this man (to ſay nothing of the *Dean*) hath (notwithſtanding the great talk of the glory of the firſt Reformation) forſaken the notion the old *church of England* had of the *church*, and of ſuch as are judged *Schiſmatical*, falling in with the *French Papacy* about Church-Government, as I will evince in the next Section.

SECT. II.

The Deans Subſtitutes agreement with the Papiſts about Schiſm, *even when he differs from the* Church of England, *detected. His notion about the Government of the Catholick Church the ſame with that of the* French Papiſt.

THAT our Author entertains notions about the nature of the *Viſible Church*, and of the *Schiſmatical*, very different from what the old *Queen Elizabeth Proteſtants* did, will appear with the greateſt conviction to ſuch as will but conſult the famous Mr. *Hooker* and Dr. *Field*, who do moſt expreſly contradict what is aſſerted in the Dean's Defence.

The

The Dean's Defender doth extremely inſiſt on the *Unity* of the Univerſal Church, as what doth conſiſt in more than in the *Unity of the Faith*, though in *combination* of thoſe *other graces* of *Love*, and *Charity*, and *Peace*, to wit, in an *external communion*, Take his own words in anſwer to a ſuppoſed objection.

P. 183. *But though Faith alone is not ſufficient to Chriſtian Unity, yet Faith in combination with thoſe other graces of Love, and Charity, and Peace, make a firm and laſting union. This I readily grant* (faith he); *but yet muſt add this one thing, That Chriſtian love, and charity, and peace, in the language of the New Teſtament, and of the ancient Fathers, when they ſignifie Chriſtian* Unity, *ſignifie alſo* one communion, *that is, the unity of a Body and Society which is external and viſible; and doth not only ſignifie the union of ſouls and affections, but the union of an external and viſible communion.*

P. 184. By the *union* of an *external* and *viſible communion*, he means the living in Chriſtian communion and fellowſhip with each other; that is, a worſhipping God together after one and the ſame *external and viſible manner.*

P. 248. Moreover he adds, That ſuch as ſeparate themſelves from the *external communion* of any particular Church that is part of the Univerſal, do ſeparate themſelves from the Univerſal viſible Church. *All Schiſmaticks*, in his opinion, cut themſelves off from the viſible Catholick Church, even as all ſuch as are *excommunicated*, are cut off.

This is the notion of the Deans Subſtitute, which is as agreeable to the ſenſe of the *Papiſt*, as 'tis in it ſelf *groſly abſurd*, and different from the doctrine of ſound *Church of England Proteſtants.*

That 'tis agreeable to the ſenſe of the *Papiſts*, you'l find in a Conference between Dr. *Peter Gunning*, and Dr. *Pierſon*, with two Diſputants of the Romiſh Profeſſion. *All Schiſmaticks* (ſay the Romiſh Diſputants) *are out of the Church, and quite ſeparate from it, as a part cut off is ſeparate from the body. Schiſmatick is a term contradiſtinct to Catholick. No Schiſmaticks can be true members of the Catholick church; for Schiſm*, as they define it, *is a voluntary ſeparation of one part from the whole true viſible church of Chriſt.* The correſpondency that there is between the *Author* of the *Deans Defence*, and thoſe *Papiſts*, about the *formal reaſon of Schiſm*, is as much as if the Defender had fetcht his Definition

tion of *Schiſm* out of their Writings; which notion, as embrac'd by one that profeſſes himſelf a *Proteſtant*, is as groſly abſurd, as 'tis contrary unto *Proteſtant principles.*

I ſay, ſuch a notion entertain'd by a profeſſed Proteſtant, is groſly abſurd; for it expoſeth him to the triumph of the *Roman-catholicks*, it being impoſſible that the *Papiſts*, notwithſtanding their *Schiſmatical* Impoſitions, ſhould be eſteemed *Schiſmatical* by our Author. For all ſuch as are Schiſmatical, are (ſaith he) cut off from the viſible Catholick Church, of which the Church of *Rome* is acknowledged to be a *true part*, although from it theſe men, as they are Proteſtants, ſeparate, and ſo cut themſelves off from the Catholick viſible Church; for ſuch as ſeparate from any true part of the Catholick church, according unto him, do cut themſelves off from the Catholick church, and are Schiſmaticks.

Take a view then of the admirable abilities of our *Auther*, who muſt be conſidered to aſſert, either that the *Church of Rome* is *Schiſmatical*, or *not*. If *not* Schiſmatical, the *church of England* muſt be *ſo*, or otherwiſe there may be a ſeparation from the external communion of a particular Church that is a part of the Univerſal, without being guilty of Schiſm or of ſeparating from the Catholick church. But if the Church of *Rome be Schiſmatical*, 'tis either cut off from the viſible Catholick church, or not; if *not*, then *Schiſm* conſiſts not in a ſeparating from the viſible Catholick church; that is, a man may be a Schiſmatick, and yet a member of the *catholick church*, a thing that our Author denies. But if the *church of Rome* be cut off from the viſible Catholick church, then the diſtreſſed *Papiſt* is in as ſad a condition as the Diſſenter; he is cut off from the church of Chriſt, and muſt be either damn'd, or ſaved by another *Name* than that of Jeſus Chriſt. If the *latter*, then farewell Chriſtian Religion. If the *former*, Where ſhall we find any part of the Univerſal Church beſide the *Church* of *England*? All the *Proteſtants* beyond the Sea are in the ſame ſtate with the Diſſenter at home; The *Church* of *Rome*, and all ſuch as are in Subjection to that *See*, are cut off from the Viſible *Catholik Church*, and it may be all the Eaſtern Churches in the World too; that is, the Catholick Viſible *Church* is confin'd within the Pale of the *Church* of *England*. Pure *Prelatical Donatiſm* with a witneſs! Where will not Confidence, when the attendant of Ignorance, lead men. Moreover,

This

This Notion as 'tis groſly abſurd, in like manner 'tis moſt contrary to the old *Proteſtant* Principles. Conſult *Hooker*'s *Eccleſiaſtical Polity*, lib. 3. and you'll find nothing more fully aſſerted than, *That the Viſible Church of Jeſus Chriſt is therefore One in outward Profeſſion of thoſe things, which ſupernaturally appertain to the very eſſence of Chriſtianity, and are neceſſarily required in every particular Chriſtian man.* ——*But we ſpeak now of the Viſible Church, whoſe Children are ſigned with this mark,* One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm. *In whomſoever theſe things are, the Church doth acknowledg them for her Children.* So far *Hooker*. But you will, it may be, object, That ſuch as are *Schiſmatical*, or *Excommunicate*, may acknowledge *One Lord*, hold *One Faith*, and receive *One Baptiſm*, And ſhall ſuch be conſider'd as Members of the Viſible *Church*? Take Mr. *Hooker's* own words for an Anſwer, *If by external Profeſſion they be Chriſtians, then are they of the Viſible Church of Chriſt; and Chriſtians by external Profeſſion are they all, whoſe mark of Recognizance hath in it thoſe things which we have mentioned; yea, although they be impious Idolaters, wicked Hereticks, Perſons Excommunicable, yea and caſt out for notorious Improbity.*

Thus 'tis evident, that Mr. *Hooker* entertain'd apprehenſions quite contrary to thoſe of our *Author*; yea and Mr. *Hooker* doth conſider the very Notion aſſerted by our Author to be Popiſh, which he doth as ſuch moſt excellently expoſe. *As for the Act of Excommunication*, (ſaith he) *it neither ſhuts out from the* Myſtical, *nor clean from the* Viſible, *but only from the Fellowſhip with the* Viſible *in holy Duties.* In contradiction to which the *Dean's Subſtitute's* Aſſertion is, p. 226. *That Excommunication caſts a man out of the viſible Society of Chriſt's Church, not of this or that particular Church only, but of the Whole Chriſtian Church.* ——*He that is caſt out of one Church, is thereby caſt out of all, and ſeparated from the Body of Chriſt, which is but One.* ——*And therefore ſuch are out of a ſtate of Salvation.* As if it had been ſaid in oppoſition to Mr. *Hooker*, Such as are Excommunicate are ſhut out clean from the Viſible *Church*, yea and from the Myſtical *Church*. A Notion that Mr. *Hooker* conſiders as held by none but *Papiſts*, for he immediatly addreſſeth himſelf to the *Church* of *Rome*, thus; *With what congruity then* (ſaith he) *doth the Church of* Rome *deny, that her enemies whom ſhe holds always for Hereticks, do at all appertain to the Church of Chriſt?* ——*How exclude*

clude they us from being any part of the Church of Christ, under the colour and pretence of Hereſie, when they cannot but grant it poſſible, even for him [i. e. *the Pope*] *to be as touching his own perſonal perſwaſion Heretical, who in their opinion not only is of the Church, but holdeth the chief place of Authority over the ſame?* The like may be ſaid by way of Anſwer unto our *Author*. Moreover the *Learned* and *Judicious* Dr. *Field*, Son of the *Church*, is as full in contradicting what is aſſerted by our *Author*. For this Dr. of the *Church*, diſcourſing about the Schiſmatick, ſays, lib. 1. c. 13. *That their departure is not ſuch, but that notwithſtanding their Schiſme, they are and remain parts of the Church of God.* ----*Schiſmaticks, notwithſtanding their Separation, remain ſtill conjoyn'd with the reſt of God's people, in reſpect of the profeſſion of the whole ſaving Truth of God, all outward acts of Religion, and Divine Worſhip, Power of Order, and Holy Sacraments, which they by vertue thereof adminiſter, and ſo ſtill are and remain parts of the Church of God.* ——The like is aſſerted of ſuch as are caſt out by *Excommunication*, c. 15.

But I'll not enlarge any further, having ſufficiently evinc'd, that the Opinions of this man, who treats the Diſſenters with ſo much ſcorn and contempt, are ſuch as were antiently by Queen *Elizabeths Proteſtants* exploded as *Popiſh*; and at this very time, I verily believe, rejected by the greateſt part of the *Epiſcopal Clergy*; and that the *Conteſt now* is not ſo much between *Diſſenters* and the *Church* of *England*, as between a few under the name of the *Church* of *England* on the one part, and the greater number of the *Church* of *England*, with the Diſſenter, on the other. The *former* under the notion of running down Diſſenters, are preparing materials to meet the Papiſt: The *other*, to the end they may the more effectually prevent the Deſigns of *Rome*, have ſent forth their *Plea for the Nonconformiſt*, finding themſelves concern'd to check the Inſolence of thoſe, who in this day of common Calamity, would ruine the conſcientious *Proteſtant* Diſſenter.

This being ſo, I muſt beſeech the *Reader* not to miſapprehend me in what follows, as if I had been ſpeaking reproachfully of the *Church* of *England*; becauſe I cannot but diſcover, how agreeable the Sentiments of the Deans Subſtitute about *Church-Government* are, unto thoſe embrac'd by the *French Papiſt*.

That I may the more clearly ſhew what are the miſchievous

Tendencies

Tendencies of our Author's Notion about *Church-Government*, I will give in ſhort, the moſt diſtinct, and trueſt ſtate of the *Controverſie* I can, ſhewing *what is granted by ſound Proteſtants, and what not*; *What are the Doctrines of the Papiſts*: How far the *French* and *Italian Papiſt* agree, and wherein they differ, and in what reſpects the *Dean*'s *Subſtitute* concurs with the *French*.

§ 1. All are ſo far *agreed* as to conclude, That God hath had a *Church* at all times in every Age of the World. We might be very particular in conſidering the divers Denominations under which the *Church* falls, anſwerable to the divers capacities of the Members thereof, and the divers ſtates in which it is and hath been, which I ſhall at this time paſs by.

§ 2. That the *Church* is but One, one Body united to one Head.

§ 3. That this One *Church* muſt be conſidered, as the Members thereof are ſcattered up and down the World, *&c.* and as they are joyned together in particular Societies. The *former* is call'd the *Church Univerſal*, the *other* a *Particular Church*.

The *Papiſts* themſelves do acknowledge, That the *Church* muſt be conſidered as *Univerſal* and as *Particular*; though they look'd on the Univerſal to be ſuch, whoſe whole exiſtence was in Particulars; as *Univerſale eſt unum in multis ſingularibus*: Whence it follows, That ſuch as are not members of a Particular *Church*, they belong not unto the Catholick Viſible *Church*. This very Notion hath been embrac'd by ſome, to wit, the *Old Independents*; but of late it hath been generally exploded by Divines of that name, they leaving it to entertain ſuch as the Dean's Subſtitute.

§ 4. That the *Church* of Chriſt is under Government. There is ſuch a thing as *Church*-Government *jure divino*.

The *Papiſts*, both *French* and *Italian*; The *Proteſtants*, whether *Epiſcopal*, *Presbyterian*, *Congregational*, or *Anabaptiſt*, heartily agree in *Theſi* about this.

§ 5. The great difference is concerning what that *Church-Government* is, which is of Divine Inſtitution: Where 'tis ſeated, whether in a *Particular*, or in the *Univerſal Church*; and whether it be *Monarchical*, *Ariſtocratical*, or *Democratical*, or *mixt*.

§ 6. The *Papiſts*, with whom the Doctor's Subſtitute doth agree, aſſert, That the *Univerſal Church* is the πρῶτον δικτυὸν of Church-Government; That all *Church*-Officers belong to the

Universal *Church*, and have an Original Right to govern the whole Universal Church.

Take the notion as found in the *Defence*. *We must* (saith he) *consider, that all the Apostles had relation to the whole Church; and therefore, though being finite creatures they could not be every where at a time, but betook themselves to different places, and planted Churches in several Countreys, and did more peculiarly apply themselves to the government of those Churches which they themselves had planted, and ordained Bishops to succeed them in their care and charge; yet their Original Right and Power in relation to the whole Church, did still remain, which they might re-assume when they saw occasion for it; and which did oblige them to take care as far as possibly they could, that the Church of Christ suffer'd no injury by the heresie or evil practises of any of their Colleagues.* P. 212.

§ 7. The *Protestants* (excepting some obscure Writers) assert *particular Churches* to be the πρῶτον δεκτικὸν of Church-Government; among whom there are these differences.

1. The *Episcopal* and *Presbyterian* differ from the *Congregational* and *Anabaptistical* about the extent of *particular Churches*, e.g. the *latter* concluding that their number must be no more than are capable of personal communion; the *former* contrarily judg, That a company of a greater extent may be included within the confines of a particular Church, who in the management of their discourses concerning it, give too great an advantage unto the Papacy.

2. The Episcopal and Presbyterian differ from some of the Congregational concerning the nature of Discipline, the Congregational being esteemed as espousers of a *Democracy*, or *Popularcy*, the other against it.

3. The *Episcopal* differs from the *Presbyterian*, in that the *Episcopal* are for a *Monarchy*, the *Presbyterian* for an *Aristocracy*.

§ 8. All Protestants generally agree in asserting the *Independency of particular Churches*.

'Tis notorious that the *Church of England* established by Law, is a *particular National Church, independent on any Foreign Power whatsoever*. Such is the constitution of our Church, that what *Bishop* soever is found an abuser of his Power, he is not accountable to any *Colledg of Bishops*, but such as are conven'd by his Maje-

Majesties Authority; and that what apprehensions soever he may have of his being griev'd through any undue procedure, he cannot make any *Appeal* to any *Foreign Power from the King*.

'Tis the *King* who is the Supreme Head of the Church of *England*; there is no Power on earth equal unto, or above *his* in *Ecclesiastical Affairs*. To appeal unto any Foreign Power, whether unto *one Bishop* singly, or unto *many* by consent assembled, 'tis to do what tends to the subverting the present Constitution; yea, 'tis to subvert the very foundation of our Government, as 'tis opposite unto a *French* or an *Italian Papacy*.

Whoever consults the many Laws made in *Henry* the 8*th*'s time, *Edward the* 6*th*'s, and *Queen Elizabeths*, cannot but be fully satisfied that the *Appeal* of any Bishop, or any other person, from the *King* unto any other *Foreign Power*, is contrary unto the *ancient Laws* of this Realm; and that *such* as shall venture the doing so, run themselves into a *Præmunire*. For 'tis most apparent, that our *National Church of England* is a *particular Independent Church*. That neither the *Pope of Rome*, nor the *Bishop of Paris*, nor any other Foreign Bishops, have any Original Right or Power in relation to *England*; and that therefore their assuming any such power, is a sinful Usurpation. All this is undoubtedly true. Yet,

§ 9. The Deans Substitute exposeth the *Independency* of Episcopal particular Churches, as what is inconsistent with Catholick Union; and asserts, That if any Bishops abuse their Power, they are accountable unto a General Council, that is, unto a *Foreign Power*, whereby he doth his utmost to tare up the Church of *England* by the Roots, to subvert his Majesties Supremacy, as if all the Laws of the Land concerning it had not been of any force. All this by Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Defender.

That this is so, I'le evince from our Authors own words, which are as follow, *And now I cannot but wonder* (saith he) *to find some Learned men very zealous assertors of the Independency of Bishops, and to alledg St.* Cyprians *Authority for it: for what ever difficulty there may be in giving an account of every particular saying in St.* Cyprian, *certainly he would never be of this opinion, who asserts but One Chair, One Apostolical Office and Power, which now resides in the Bishops of the Universal Church; for when the same*

Power

Power is in ten thouſand hands, it can be but One only by Unity of conſent *in the exerciſe of it; and 'tis very wild to imagine that any one of theſe perſons who abuſe this Power, ſhall not be accountable to the reſt for it,* i. e. *to the Colledg of Biſhops; for* (ſaith he ſoon after) *if we conſider the practiſe of the ancient Church, we ſhall find that they never thought every Biſhop to be Independent, but as liable to the cenſure of their Colleagues, as Presbyters and Deacons were to the cenſure of their Biſhops.* P. 212. So far our Author, who doth as it were expreſly aſſert, That the *Archbiſhop of Canterbury*, though *Metropolitan* and *Primate of England*, if he abuſes his Power, is accountable unto the General Council, when by conſent aſſembled; that is, the *Archbiſhop*, who is not in power above any other *Biſhops*, (as is by the Deans Subſtitute aſſerted) abuſing his Power, is accountable to ſome Court above any in this Realm, to a General Council, a Colledg of Biſhops.

§ 10. Although the *Papiſts* generally aſſert, That the Univerſal Church is the πρῶτον δεκτικὸν of all Church-Government as hath been already intimated; yet there's a *difference* between the *French* and *Italian Papiſt* about the *kind* of the *Government*; the one inſiſting on an *Ariſtocracy*, the other on a *Monarchy*, i. e. the *French* holds, That the *pars Regens* of the *Univerſal Church* is a General Council; the *Italian*, That it is one ſingle perſon, *viz.* the Biſhop of *Rome*.

There hath been in the Church of *Rome* for ſome hundred years, a great conteſt concerning the Supreme *Regent part* of the Univerſal Church, Whether it be a *General Council*, or the *Pope*. Whether a *General Council* be above the *Pope*, or the *Pope* above a *General Council*. About which the Church of *Rome* is fallen into *three parts*, as *Bellarmine* aſſerts.

1. That the *Pope* is the *Supreme Head* of the Church, and ſo much above a *General Council*, that *he cannot ſubject himſelf thereunto*. The Government of the Univerſal Church, though *mixt*, being compoſed of a *Democracy*, *Ariſtocracy*, and *Monarchy*, yet principally 'tis *Monarchical*. The Supreme Power being immediately lodg'd in the *Monarch*, who is the Biſhop of *Rome*, *Chriſts Vicar*, and *Peter's Succeſſor*, he is above a *General Council*, and not accountable to any on earth for any abuſe he may be guilty of. Of this opinion, ſaith *Bellarmine*, are all the Schoolmen generally, eſpecially *Sanctus Antonius*, *Joannes de Tur-*

Turrecremata, *Alvarus Pelagius*, *Dominicus Jacobatius*, *Cajetan*, *Pighius*, *Ferrariensis*, *Augustinus de Ancona*, *Petrus de Monte*, &c. Yea, this is the sense of the Jesuits generally, and of all such as are engag'd to support the *Court of Rome*, as are the *Italian Bishops*, for which reason I call it *Italian Popery*.

2. There are some among the *Canonists* who assert, That the Pope is above a General Council, but yet may subject himself hereunto.

3. There are others who assert, That a *General Council* is above the *Pope*, that the *Supreme Governing-power* over the whole *Catholick Church* is given them *immediately*; that the *Pope*, as every other Bishop, is accountable to the *General Council*.

This is what hath been asserted by the Council at *Constance*, *Anno* 1315. and by that of *Basil*, *Anno* 1431. and by many Learned Divines in the *Church of Rome*, viz. *Cardinal Cameracensis*, *Joannes Gerson*, *Jacobus Almain*, *Nicolas Cusanus*, *Panormitanus*, and his Master Cardinal *Florentinus*, as also by *Abulensis*.

Gerson being a *Chancellor at Paris*, had many followers among the *French*, who at this very day assert, That the *Supreme Regent part of the Universal Church*, is a *General Council*; for which reason I conclude, that such as assert, That a General Council is the Political Head or Regent part of the Universal Church, are in the number of *French Papists*.

Thus *Cassander*, yea and *Grotius*, as to Church-Government, were for a *French Papacy*. Whether the Dean's Substitute be or be not, I'le leave to the *impartial censure* of the judicious *Reader*, who is desired to consider his notion as compared with that of the *Parisians*.

I. The Dean's Substitute doth suggest, That the *Universal Church* is the *first Seat of Government*; 'tis a *political organiz'd Body*, in which there is a *Pars Imperans & Subdita*, the Bishops in their *Colledg* being the Governours, or *Pars Imperans*, and all others of the *Universal Church* the *subdite part*.

It may be our Author to gratifie the *Dean*, will deny the *Universal Church* to be a *political organiz'd body*, as indeed he doth; but 'tis even when he's resolv'd to assert, That the *Universal church* is the Seat of *Government* and *Discipline*; as if there could be any *Government* in any *Society*, without a *governing and governed parts*. But so it is, as a *National*, even so the *Universal*

ſal church with him is not a *political body*, that is, 'tis not *ſuch a body* unto whoſe conſtitution a *pars Imperans* and *ſubdita* is neceſſary, even when its conſtitution is ſuch that it cannot be but there muſt be in it ſome *Governours*, and other *Governed*. There is not a *Regent part* in the Catholick Church, but there is a Governing part; that is, there are Governours, *viz.* the Catholick Biſhops in their Colledg, who are the Governours of the Catholick church.

Thus our Learned Gentleman in one place endeavouring to fetch the *Dean* off from that difficulty Mr. *Humphreys* had driven him unto, concerning the *conſtitutive Regent part* of the *church of England* as *National*, doth ſay, *The Dean anſwers in my poor opinion, with great judgment and conſideration, We deny any neceſſity of ſuch a conſtitutive Regent part* ——— *For though a National church be one body, yet it is not ſuch a political body as Mr.* B. *deſcribes*, i. e. *there is no ſuch Government as cannot be without a* Pars Regens & Subdita, p. 562. And yet he grants, That Church-Governours united and governing by conſent, are the *pars Imperans*, and *chriſtian people* in obedience to the Laws of our Saviour, ſubmitting to ſuch government, are the *pars ſubdita*. p. 565. All which is true (ſaith he) without a Conſtitutive Regent Head, (*i. e.*) There is a Governing part or a *pars Regens*; or to ſpeak Engliſh, a Conſtitutive Regent part or Head, without a Conſtitutive Regent Head. The like is aſſerted of the Univerſal Church, namely, That it is a Church governed by the Colledge of Biſhops, which Colledge of Biſhops are the *Pars Imperans*, though not the conſtitutive Regent part. For we muſt allow him to wallow in his contradictions. But a Governing part there is in the Univerſal Church, which Governing part is compos'd of Biſhops.

II. *The Governours of the Univerſal* Church *are Catholick Biſhops in* Council, who though they are equals, and as ſuch have no Superiority over one another, *p.* 213. yet the Colledge, or theſe Biſhops aſſembled, have Authority and command over any of its collegues; that is, every ſingle Biſhop is under the Authority and command of this Foreign Council.

III. The Catholick Church is *One*, when it is not rent and divided, but united and coupled by the cement of Biſhops, who ſtick cloſe together, *p.* 596.

The reſult of all is, That the Catholick Church of Chriſt being

ing one Visible Political Body, it is a compleatly Organiz'd body on Earth, hath its Governing and Governed parts; The Visible Governing part being a Terrestrial Numerical Head, though collective, *viz.* A Colledge of Bishops, a General Council.

A Notion that doth not only subvert the present constitution of the *Church* of *England*, that thinks not it self accountable to any such Forreign Power; but moreover in it self as grosly absurd, as 'tis suited to the *French*, the *Cassandrian*, or the *Grotian* Model, leading us all to *Unite* with all the other parts of the *Catholick Church*, by rendring an unwarrantable Obedience unto such a Governing Power as is seldom in being. and when so, as dangerous and of as destructive a tendency to the Government of Jesus Christ, as that of the *Italian* Papacy.

But whether our Author had a clear prospect of this Intreague, when at first he was put on it, I'll not venture to determine; it being sufficient that I have fully proved, That the *New-Model'd Episcopacy* of this Gentleman is the same with that of the *French*; which is as inconsistent with the old-establish'd Episcopacy of our *Church*, as is the *Italian* Papacy. For if our Author may safely exceed the bounds of those Laws, that do with the greatest Severity forbid our *Appeal* to any *Forreign Power*, by addressing himself unto a *Forreign Colledge*, Why may not another presume to make his *Appeal to the Court of* Rome? What Reason can be given for the *One*, which will not prove cogent for the *Other*; especially to such, who, living where they have constant experiences of the excellency of a *Monarchical Government* in the *State*, may be easily induced to conclude Monarchy as admirable in the *Church*, and then farewel Impossibilities, viz. *General Councils*, a *Roman* Monarch in the *Church* being much more desirable.

Having thus given a true state of the Controversie, whereby we find our Author to agree exactly with the *French Papist* about *Government*, asserting the *Universal Church* as *such*, to be a *Governed Body*, in which there is a *Governour*, and the *Governed*; 'twill be requisite, that as I have shewn what are some of the Absurdities which flow from it, that I do moreover evince it to be in it self *unsound* and *false*.

That this may the more clearly and with the greater conviction be performed, I will be so just, as to do our *Author* all the right imaginable, by taking notice what he seems to assert, and

what he's resolv'd to deny, and accordingly proceed to the strictest disquisition after the *Truth*.

Our Author asserts, *That the Universal Church*, as such, *is the Seat of Government*, 'tis a *Body under Government*; as much as if it had been said, There must be in it a *Governing*, and a *Governed* part. It being impossible that *Government* should be without *Order*, which Order is *secundum sub, & Supra*. Wherever there is Government, there must be a Superiour part Governing, and an Inferiour Governed. There must be *Dominus & Subditus*. This our Author seems to grant, when he doth to this Assertion of the Government of the *Universal Church*, add his thoughts about the *Governours* thereof; which, he saies, are the *Universal Bishops assembled in Council*.

But although this is what our Author doth assert, he doth notwithstanding resolutely deny the *Universal Church to be a Political Body*; what he saith of a *National*, that he asserts of the *Universal Church*, *both* which are *Govern'd Societies*, but *neither a Political Body*, p. 564, 565. All which is to fetch off the Dean from Mr. *Humphrey's* and Mr. *B's* unanswerable *Queries* concerning the *constitutive Regent part of a National church*, whose existence must be acknowledged, if a National *church* as such be a Governed *church*, or a Body Politick; but yet this cannot be found out. For which reason they distinguish between a *Governed Society* and a *Body Politick*; between a *Governing* and a *Regent part*, and assert, *That the National church is a Govern'd Society*, but not *a Body Politick*; that it hath a Governing, but not a Regent part; the like of an *Universal church*.

This is the true state of our Author's Judgment, wherein we have an admirable account of the Gentleman's acute distinguishing, the excellency of which I'll leave to the entertainment of his Admirers; and if he please, consider the Notion according to his own stating it: that is, to gratifie him, I won't insist on the word *Policy*, nor *Regent*, nor *constitutive Regent* part; but only on *Government*, *Governours*, and *Governed*; and so our Enquiry being about the *Government* of the *Universal Church*, we must consider what is necessary thereunto, and see whether what our Author asserts be agreeable unto such a constitution; for if not so, 'tis far from Truth.

To consider what it is that is necessary to the constitution of any *Governed Body*; that is, what is so necessary, that the absence

abſence thereof is deſtructive to the Conſtitution? To this I Anſwer,

That a *Governing*, and a *Governed* part is ſo neceſſary unto *Goverement*, that where either one of theſe be abſent, there can be no Government. A Governed Body cannot be without a Governing Part, neither can this be without a part Governed. Government doth neceſſarily infer both theſe; remove either one, & the Government is deſtroyed. Government is a Relation reſulting from that mutual reſpect the Governing and Governed parts have to each other, whence as *Sublato uno Relatorum tollitur & alterum*; and where there is nor Subject nor Term, *(i. e.)* nor *Relate* nor *Correlate*, there can be no *Relation*. Remove the Governing part from the Univerſal or National *Church*, and the Government ceaſes. Paternity may be where there is no Father, aſſoon as Government without a Governing part. Whence I infer, *That where there is a* Fixed Government, *there muſt be a* fixed Governing part.

This premiſed, Let us next enquire, whether or no what our Author aſſerts, be ſuitable to this *undoubted Rule*? Doth he ſhew us ſuch a Governing part? The Government is a conſtant fixed Government, but where is the conſtant fixed Governing part? 'Tis a *General Council*, ſaith he, *i. e.* the univerſal Biſhops in their Colledge aſſembled. But is this a fixed Governing part? Is it not evident to an ordinary capacity, that the aſſembling ſuch a Council of all the Biſhops in the World, is a difficulty inſuperable; and that without ſuch an Aſſembly, 'tis impoſſible they ſhould by joynt conſent govern the Univerſal *Church*. The aſſembling of the *Catholick* Biſhops is as eaſie as the gathering together their conſent *per literas formatas*, and much more conducive to the deſired End; becauſe when aſſembled they can debate the matters before 'em, and with the greater judgment give their determinations.

But 'tis well known, that had ſuch an Aſſembly been poſſible, yet the *Church* of God for the firſt 300 years, had no ſuch Aſſembly, excepting that in the Apoſtles days, *i. e.* it had no ſuch *Governing part*; which is as if it had been ſaid, There was no Government in the *Univerſal Church* the firſt 300 years.

To gratifie our Author, Let us ſuppoſe that the *Univerſal Church* is as ſuch a Governed Society, and that it hath its Go-

vernours. But though this be ſo, yet it muſt be ſtill acknowedged, that a *Governour* cannot be without *Power* to Govern; I would therefore beſeech my Author to ſhew me, What is that Power with which this Colledge of Biſhops are inveſted? Is it *Legiſlative* only, or alſo *Executive?* Whether the one or the other, is it in the Colledge *Subjectively* and *Formally*, or only in 'em as *in fine ſeu regulante*, or *ſupplente*, or How? 'Twould be neceſſary that our Author conſult the *Pariſian* Doctors, if he will ſpeak to the purpoſe, when he eſpouſes their Notion.

Let our Author aſſert as it pleaſeth him at an adventure, it matters not, for his Notion is ſuch as neceſſarily directs us to conclude what he muſt, if he will be conſiſtent with himſelf, aſſert, and that is this, *All Church-Goverment is Univerſal, and as ſuch it muſt be exerciſed*; no one being a Governour in the *Church*, but he that is a Catholick Officer: That the due courſe of exerciſing this Power is, when it flows originally from the Head unto all its Members. That it flows from the Inviſible, or rather unſeen Head in Heaven immediately unto the viſible Head on Earth, is granted by all thoſe who aſſert an Univerſal *Church*-Government; though there is a Diſpute among the *Papiſts*, whether this Head be the Council, or the Pope. As it flows immediately from Chriſt to the viſible Head, ſo it proceeds from this viſible Head unto the Patriarchs, from thence to the Metropolitans, from thence to the Dioceſans. For which Reaſon if any are injur'd by their Dioceſan, they may Appeal to their Metropolitan, from thence to their Patriarch, from thence to the Pope or Council. This our Author muſt hold. That there may be no wrong done the Little Ones of Chriſt, if any be grieved by *One*, he may Appeal unto an Higher, till he comes unto the Higheſt Power on Earth; from whence if he find not relief, he muſt acquieſce, leaving the whole to him who is in Heaven. But if there be no conſtant viſible Head actually exiſting, where ſhall the grieved lodge his laſt Appeal? The Dean's Subſtitute ſuppoſes an equality of Power in Patriarchs, Metropolitans, and Dioceſans; whence if his Dioceſan doth abuſe his Power, he is not accountable to any Metropolitan, nor Patriarch, but only unto the *Catholick Colledge*. The which being ſo, 'twill follow, That Executive Power muſt be lodg'd in ſome Supreme Head *Subjectively*, who can receive

Appeals:

Appeals: I ſay *Subjectively*, or Formally, and not only *Virtually*; for 'tis an Executive Power only that can relieve in this caſe; which cannot *Actually* be, where 'tis only *Virtually*. For which Reaſon 'tis evident, that according to our Author, there muſt be a *fixed Governing part* inveſted with an *Executive Power*, from whom relief is to be expected, if at any time the Dioceſan doth abuſe his Power; which Governing part muſt be either a *Colledge of Biſhops*, or one *ſingle Perſon*. And if the obtaining the *former* be, as indeed 'tis impoſſible, the acknowledging the *latter* is neceſſary.

Thus we ſee how fairly this Gentleman at length leads us to *Rome*, or ſome other Pope, as the only neceſſary way of governing the *Church*. In doing which, he doth but carry on the Project, of which Sir *Francis Winnington* takes notice at the Trial of the Lord *Stafford*, when he aſſured the Lords, *That as an encouragement to the* POPISH PLOTTERS, *there did appear in ſome men too eaſie and favourable a Diſpoſition towards the* PAPISTS. *They were grown ſtrangely* MODERATE *towards theſe* OLD ENEMIES *of our Church and State. New* PROJECTS *of* RECONCILING *of us were ſet on foot, and Books were written to diſtinguiſh the Church of* Rome *from the Court of* Rome. *One of thoſe Books, which was Printed the year before the Diſcovery of the Plot, pretends, That there ought to be a Difference made between Papiſts of* LOYAL *and* DISLOYAL *Principles. This Book, as it was written more* ARTIFICIALLY *than the reſt, and Publiſhed in ſo Critical and Dangerous a Juncture, deſerves, and I doubt not in time will have a particular Conſideration. 'Tis eaſie to believe how great Encouragement this muſt give to the* ROMANISTS, *to ſee how very willing men were to meet them, and how freely the Pen was drawn in their Favour.*

By this time the *Reader* may eaſily ſee who 'tis that is ſubſervient to the *Popiſh Deſign*, and without any further help clearly perceive what is the Tendency of our Author's Diſcourſe. There remaineth only one objection which calls for our obſervation, the which can be no ſooner remov'd, but the *Reader* may be fully ſatisfied in this, *viz.* That 'tis not impoſſible for one who Aſſents and Conſents to the Thirty nine Articles, the Book of Common-prayer, and of Homilies, to drive on a *French* (not to ſay a *Popiſh*) Deſign.

The

The Objection that occurs to a common capacity, is, How can ſuch that give in Aſſent and Conſent to all that is *ſaid* of the excellency of the preſent Eſtabliſhment, do any thing that tends to its ſubverſion?

The Anſwer is eaſie; You muſt diſtinguiſh between the *ſayings* and the *things* aſſented and conſented unto. For you do not Aſſent unto the *Sayings*, though about the excellency of the preſent Eſtabliſhment, but the *Things*; for ſaith he, p. 105. We do not give our Aſſent to every *ſaying* in the Common-prayer-book, but to every *thing* which is contained in, and preſcrib'd by it; that is, what we are bound to uſe. Whence obſerve, That ſeeing a Papiſt can comply with all the Ceremonies in uſe, even when he cannot Aſſent to all the Sayings in the Common-prayer-book, he may give in his Aſſent, and Conſent, and be as true a Son of the Church of *England* as our Author is.

SECT. III.

A Third Overt-act of the Enquirers pretended Immodeſty, examined. The averſneſs of the Dean and his Subſtitute to a Proteſtant Union, proved. Their falling in with the Diſſenters about conſcience, conſidered. Some Remarks on the Author's modeſt treatment of others.

THE *Enquirer* charges the Dean and ſome of the *Epiſcopal*, to be againſt any *compliances* with the *Diſſenter*, as if they ſet a greater value on the *Honour and Reputation of men, than on Union, or the relieving tender conſciences*, which is ſaid to be a *malicious* and *impudent* charge. Words very modeſt, as they drop from our Author's pen!

To this I'le reply, if poſſibly, *modeſtly*, without paſſing any further cenſure on the heat with which the *Deans Defender* expreſſeth himſelf.

'Tis true I did charge the *Dean* and ſome others of the *Epiſcopal*, as perſons who would not condeſcend to part with the leaſt *Iota* for Union, for theſe Reaſons:

1. The

1. The *Diſſenters* have uſed all juſt means, but without ſucceſs, for the obtaining of it.

2. Some of the *Epiſcopal Clergy* have for theſe laſt Twenty years made it their buſineſs to ſtir up *Authority* to a ſevere execution of ſuch Laws as were made againſt Diſſenters.

3. They were not aſhamed to expoſe His Majeſty to the great contempt of His people, when he began to ſhew pity and compaſſion to the oppreſſed Diſſenters. What Invectives came out after it! What *Satyrical* Declamations againſt it!

4. The Dr. himſelf judg'd a *ſevere execution* of Laws againſt Diſſenters, to be the moſt effectual means for the obtaining a firm and a laſting *Union*. And therefore,

1. Preached that *Sermon* which has been the ſhameful occaſion of our late conteſts. Thus they preſs for a Conformity as the only way to Union, as if there can be no Union among Chriſtians without *ſuch* Uniformity.

2. He ſo ſtates the caſe between Relief and no Relief to Diſſenters, as to incline more for *no* Relief. He hath but Three Arguments for Relief, and *Six* againſt it. Dr. *Stil. Preface*, p. 53, 54.

3. He inveighs againſt a *boundleſs Toleration*, as the Mother of all confuſion; and then tells us, That the ſuſpenſion of Penal Laws againſt Proteſtant Diſſenters, is to open the Flood-gates to ſuch a boundleſs Toleration; and yet they are for great Abatements.

In *five*, 'tis remarkable, That notwithſtanding the many Proteſtations made of a propenſion toward a *real union* between *Conformiſt* and *Nonconformiſt*, nothing is more notoriouſly evident, than that *thoſe* among the Diſſenters who are *moſtly diſpoſed* to ſome compliances with the *Epiſcopal*, are above all others hated and contemned by ſuch as our Author.

There are ſome among Diſſenters, (namely the *Reverend* Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *Humphrey*,) whoſe Moderation in theſe things hath been ever ſince their ejection for their Nonconformity practically diſcover'd to the whole Kingdom. They frequently attend on the *Conformiſts Miniſtry*, not ſcrupling to be preſent at their *prayers*, nor at the *Sacrament* of the Lords Supper. Yea, they ſhew with the greateſt evidence deſirable, That their *diſpoſition* toward the accommodating the matters in differ-

ence

ence between *Conformiſt* and *Nonconformiſt* is ſuch, that nothing but *apparent ſin* ſhould hinder their conformity. But yet none more expos'd to contempt by the Dean and his Subſtitute, than theſe men! 'Tis Mr. *Baxter* who writes in a continued fit of anger. 'Tis he is the man to be *pitied*; and no wonder, for his Subſtitute gives great reaſon for it, *viz.* Mr. *B.* is the *Judas*, the moſt *dangerous Enemy* that lodges in the boſome of the *Church*; a *Cataline*, a *Protean Religioniſt*, *who transforms himſelf into all ſhapes*; and *differs from the* Hobbiſt *only in this, That the* Hobbiſt *is for being always of his Prince's Religion*, but *he is always for being againſt it.* P. 234.

This is the character which the Dean's Defender gives of that *Reverend and Peaceable Divine*, Mr. *Baxter*, and that principally, becauſe he is *ſo much inclin'd to unite* with the Conformiſt; as if the Gentleman, and ſuch as are of his *Gang*, were afraid of a Proteſtant Union.

But, Sir, is this the way to Union? Is this the way to peace? What, to let out all your wrath, and rage, and fury, againſt ſuch as are moſt peaceable, and ready to unite with you? What thinking and unbiaſſed mind can be perſuaded to conclude, That thoſe very men, who after ſuch an unclean and indecent manner revile the peace-maker, are in love with peace? Is it poſſible that he who conſiders ſo complying a perſon as Mr. *Baxter* is, to be for that reaſon a *Judas*, a *Cataline*, a *Protean Religioniſt*, ſhould be pleaſed with his compliances?

This certainly doth but diſcover, That if the *Nonconformiſts* could conſcientiouſly conform to more than really they can, it would not conduce to their relief, if ſuch as our Author could prevent; They muſt do all you exact, or elſe no peace to be expected; they muſt comply with every *iota*, or no Union. Moreover, when they have conformed to every impos'd *iota*, they muſt alſo ſeparate themſelves from all the good Chriſtians in the Land that are not of their perſuaſion in every thing, or be ſtill *Schiſmatical*; yea, though a man conforms, if he be more of a *Chriſtian temper* than our hot and fiery *Author*, that is, if he be but *compaſſionate towards Diſſenters*, ſhewing a tenderneſs to their *Conſciences*, 'tis enough to make him the object of their rage. Witneſs the *Countrey Conformiſt*, who notwithſtanding the greatneſs of his Learning, and the excellency of his

his temper, diſcovered in his *Remarks*, is treated by the Dean's Subſtitute, *Pref.* p. 6. as one who is for *raiſing a Civil War for the pulling down Church and State, to ſet up a Presbyterian Parity.* Thus they deal with ſuch as are for Peace, and yet would be thought to be for *great Abatements* for peace ſake, as men ſincerely diſpos'd to unite with us; that is, they are ſo, if it may be without parting with one *iota* for Union.

The *High-flown Conformiſts*, with whom only our preſent Controverſie is, are very much for Union, even when 'tis moſt obvious, that the utmoſt they are for, is the expoſing the Diſſenter: Let the Diſſenters do what they can, theſe men will not be pleaſed. There are ſeveral *ſizes* among the Diſſenters, ſome can *Conſcientiouſly do more for Union* than *others* can; but *they* that do the moſt, are not freer from the laſh of their Tongues and Pens, nor from the execution of their Laws than the other. If they come not to *Church*, then they are *Diſobedient*, *Seditious*, *Factious*, and what not? If they do go to the *Church*, they are *Judaſſes*, *Catalines*, *Protean* Religioniſts, *Hobbiſts*, &c.

Theſe things conſider'd, Let any moderate man judge, what 'tis they'll part with for Union, what are thoſe *Iota*'s. Not that I accuſe all Conformiſts, but a few, even thoſe only who are of the ſame *ſtamp* with our *Author*, who ſeem to raze the foundations of the preſent Conſtitution; For I am confident, that there are many of the very *Clergy*, who deſire nothing ſo much as the Peace of the *Church*, and the *relieving tender Conſciences.* And as for the *Magiſtracy*, 'tis evident, that as *few*, or none delight to execute the Laws againſt Diſſenters, even ſo 'tis in the heart of our *Sovereign*, the *Houſe of Lords*, and of the *Commons* of *England*, that an Expedient be found out for the *uniting Proteſtants*, and the eaſing thoſe burdens that have ſo long lain on Diſſenters; ſo that through God's Grace we may ſee a *happy Union* among *Proteſtants*, even when the *Dean* and his *Subſtitute* will not part with an *Iota* for it.

But you'll ſay, the Dr. makes Propoſals for Union in the very *Preface* againſt which I write. *Anſw.* 1. If the Doctor contradicts himſelf, whoſe fault is that? But 2. 'Tis true the *Dean* made a Propoſal of ſome *Abatements* in order unto Union, but unto whom? Let our skilful *Interpreter*, the *Dean's Subſtitute* declare. *The Dean* ſaith, *We do heartily and ſincerely deſire Union*, &c.

The meaning of which is, (ſaith our *Dean's Interpreter*) *that we are ſincerely willing to make any Condeſcenſions for Peace-ſake*, which will not overthrow the *Church* of *England*, *nor* inſinuate a falſe and ſcandalous Accuſation of the Unlawfulneſs of our Conſtitution and Rites of Worſhip, *which we cannot do with a* ſafe Conſcience, *becauſe we believe the contrary*, &c. *And we are not ſo charitable to give eaſe to other mens Conſciences to injure our own, and thereby condemn the Reformation*, &c.

In anſwer unto this, I muſt ſay, what I did unto the *Dean*, [*Enquiry*, p. 33.] It muſt be obſerved, That *Diſſenters not Conforming* to Epiſcopacy and Ceremonies, is a judging them Unlawful; which is in the Opinion of our Churchmen, a caſting a Reproach and Diſhonour on the Reformation of the *Church* of *England*, &c. To which I add, That the *Churches* parting with any of thoſe Rites of Worſhip, which the Diſſenters cannot conſcienciouſly comply with, may inſinuate into the minds of ſome men the Notion of their Unlawfulneſs. Whence, if there muſt be no Abatements made, but ſuch as do not inſinuate an Unlawfulneſs in the *Epiſcopal Conſtitution*, nor in the *Rites of Worſhip*, what manner of Abatements can there be made? 'Tis evident then, that the Doctor's *Propoſal* made with ſuch Reſtrictions and Limitations for Union, is but a more plauſible way of denying it. But what is the great Reaſon, why there muſt be no ſuch compliance, as may be attended with ſuch Inſinuations, but this, 'Tis inconſiſtent with the *Honour* of the *Reformation*, or rather of the *Reformers*: For I remember, that when the talk was about blaſting the Honour of the firſt *Reformation*, the meaning was, the calling a reproach upon *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, &c. the firſt *Reformers*; And why may we not underſtand it now in the ſame ſenſe in this place? And if ſo, How is the Charge untrue? or how comes it to be either *Impudent* or *Malicious*? But here is the Talk of *Conſcience*, They *cannot do it with ſafe Conſcience*, this ſurprizeth me. What! Is the *Dean* and his *Defender* faln into ſuch an hot fit of *Fanaticiſme*, as to talk of their not being able to make any *Abatements* in the fore-deſcribed ſenſe with a *ſafe Conſcience!* How comes this about? I am hereby inclin'd to think, That they make the *Scripture* the Rule not only of their *Doctrines*, but *Worſhip*, and *Diſcipline*, a *Preſbyterian Principle*. And, that 'tis the *Opinion of their Conſciences*,

ences, that *Episcopacy is of Divine Right*, and consequently *Unalterable*. For they must not admit of any thing contrary to the Opinion of their Consciences; still Fanaticisme, a justifying the Dissenter, who cannot *Conscienceously* Conform! Only there is an untoward Insinuation in't on the Doctor's part, namely, That the *Episcopal* Constitution is of Divine Right, and that our Church-men are not overmuch owing to our Governours for its Establishment; That if our *Governours* should go about to make any *Alteration* in the present Constitution, they offend God: For which our Governours won't give them any great thanks. But sure a mans *Conscience* may permit another, whom he cannot change, to do that which it will not permit himself to do.

Thus having considered the *Overtacts* of the Enquirers pretended Immodesty, let our *Author* make the most on't, and let the *Reader* judge, Whether there was not somewhat more than the *Reflection* on the *Enquirer*, that brought forth his first Chapter? Whether his propensions to favour our Common Enemy the *Papist*, were not stronger than his Aversions to the Enquirers Immodesty?

Here I would have put an end unto this Chapter, had it not been requisite to take some notice of the like *Treatment* which he affords Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Humfrey*, the *Country-Conformist*, and Doctor *Owen*. Not that I design to enlarge on this Subject, but only to give the *Reader* a Taste of the *Modesty* of our *Author*, who accuses others so much of *Immodesty*.

1. As for his usage of Mr. *Baxter*, 'tis such, that how immodest soever I may be esteem'd, I must solemnly profess, that I cannot without defiling my Pen express it aright: I will not therefore take any other notice of it than to say, It becomes not a *Man*, much less a *Christian*, much less a *Presbyter of the Church of* England, to treat the unworthiest of men after such a rate as he has treated Mr. *B*. I am sure, 'tis recorded in the Sacred Scriptures, that *Michael the Archangel durst not bring a railing Accusation against the Devil*. And Oh, How unmeet then is it for this man of inferiour Dignity, to rail at one so eminent in Piety and Learning!

Methinks 'tis a pitiful shift, when men have nothing but hard words to answer hard Arguments with: A way the most ineffectual to the desired End, *viz.* the confuting a Learned Adversary;

but the beſt perhaps that can be to come off. For really when there is ſo little of ſolid Anſwer to what Mr. *Baxter* hath urged againſt the Dean, this Gentlemans Treatiſe is beneath Mr. *B's* notice ; and his hard words deſerving no other Reply than, *The Lord rebuke thee.*

2. Mr. *Humfrey* and the *Country-Conformiſt* muſt come next under the Gentleman's Pen, They muſt be *Immodeſt* too, as I am, and who can help it?

But what is the matter ? what is it that occaſions all this ſtir ? Really I cannot imagine, unleſs Mr. *Humphrey's Faithfulneſs* to the *Dean*, expreſs'd in a way ſuitable to his *wonted Freedom*, be the cauſe. 'Tis true, the *Countrey Conformiſt* takes notice of Mr. *H*'s late Book, giving him thanks for that *judicious Tractate*, ſaying, That he had *modeſtly* and *plainly rebuk'd the pride of the Dr. and given Mr.* Baxter *his due praiſe*. From whence our Author takes occaſion to run into a Diſcourſe on the *Modeſty* of Mr. *Humphrey*, and produces ſeveral of his *expreſſions*, which in the apprehenſion of ſome others, who, it may be, do more impartially, yea and more agreeably to the *Chriſtian Rule*, weigh the nature of the Dean's Diſcourſe, *&c.* are not ſo lyable to exception as our *Author* ſuggeſts.

'Tis well known that the *Reverend Mr. H.* is a *grave* Miniſter, it may be twenty years elder than Dr. *Stillingfleet*, for which reaſon a reproof (though plain and open) may be *proper* in him, which would not become me or this *Author* ; eſpecially, conſidering that this Mr. *H.* is *one* whoſe inclinations to conformity are ſuch, that there can be nothing of humour to keep him from a cloſure with the *Dean*, or to provoke him to an *unneceſſary quarrel* ; which is enough to engage a judicious perſon to conclude, That if *ſuch a man* as Mr. *H.* treats the Dean ſeverely, there is ſomewhat extraordinary in the Dr. that call'd for it.

In this opinion I am abundantly confirmed, when I remember what Mr. *Baxter* in the Preface of his Second *Defence* ſayes of him, which is, That he handles the Dr. *ſomewhat freely*, that is, as the *Countrey Conformiſt* interprets it, very *honeſtly*, as the Dr. deſerv'd ; and for this reaſon, though our *Author*, who it may be hath not that ſenſe of *Conſcientious duties* upon him, as theſe others have, does *blame* it, yet it may be worthy *commendation*. For what ſhould tempt ſo *Learned* and *Judicious* a perſon, as the

Countrey

Countrey Conformiſt is, to be ſo full in approving it, unleſs the very ſubject-matter of the Drs. Diſcourſe, or the mode of managing it, did ſuggeſt, that the greateſt kindneſs could be ſhewn the Dr. was to deal plainly and uprightly in diſcovering unto him his *ſin?*

But this is enough to *expoſe the Countrey Conformiſt* preſently to the ſame laſh. He is alſo *immodeſt*; and why? ſurely for no other reaſon, that I can imagine, but becauſe he is not afraid to ſpeak the *Truth*, and to give to the world an aſſurance, That the *Dean*'s Diſcourſe was not grateful unto every Conformiſt; and that therefore, whoever would inſinuate as if the Dr. had given us the ſenſe of all his Conforming Brethren in that great Book, would abuſe and injure ſome of the moſt *judicious* and *godly* among the *Conforming Clergy.*

He hath really done the *true Church of England* great right, in making not only his *Reflections on the Deans Preface*, but alſo his *Remarks* on the *Book* it ſelf, a *Treatiſe* worthy the obſervation of the *Dean*, ſeeing the anſwering that, as appears by our Authors ſilence, is beyond his ſtrength; that is, it is ſo candidly wrote, as he ſhould be aſhamed to except againſt it.

I need not ſay any thing concerning the *Reverend Dr. Owen*, becauſe as our Author has ſpoken little of his perſon (though more than became him) but *leſs* by way of anſwer to his *Book*. However it muſt be remembred, That ſeeing our Author found himſelf neceſſitated to run unto the Tents of the *French Papiſt* for Armour to batter down the Notion Dr. O. hath eſtabliſhed in proving a *particular Church to be the* πρῶτον δεκτικὸν *of Church-Government*; the Drs. notion abides in its ſtrength, and his Book unanſwered in the ſenſe of any ſound Proteſtant; and therefore this *Feeble Defence of the Dean of Pauls*, is unworthy of ſo great a perſons Animadverſions. And that the Dean himſelf is no way reliev'd by this Defender, but as much oblig'd to attempt it himſelf, as if this Defence had never been publiſhed.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

A Reply to what the Deans Substitute ſuggeſts in his cenſuring the Enquirers *Deſign.*

THIS *Gentleman* not being able to ſatisfie himſelf with his *tedious Eſſay* to evince the *Enquirer* to be a perſon neither very Modeſt, nor very Peaceable, gives himſelf the liberty of *cenſuring the Deſign*, as if it had been rather to reproach the Dr. than to vindicate and clear up the innocency of the *Diſſenter*. Thus he ſuggeſts that *Mr.* Lobb *wrote what he wrote to expoſe the Dean to popular odium and fury; to perſuade the people never to look into the Deans book, or to ſtone him as an implacable enemy to all Loyal Diſſenters.* Pref. p. 30. Book p. 6.

What reply is neceſſary to be made unto this charge, is not eaſie to imagine; for what though I ſhould ſolemnly declare, That the caſting reproach on Dr. *Stillingfleet*, or any other perſon, is what I perfectly hate; will he believe me? I can, and hereby do declare ſo much; but is it poſſible our Author ſhould give credit to any ſuch proteſtation, ſo long as 'tis almoſt natural for a man of his *complexion* to judg of others according to thoſe over-ſtrong propenſions he finds in himſelf to ſuch expoſing practiſes?

However, let me ask the Author what 'tis that provokes him to talk ſo confidently of the moſt *ſecret motions* of my ſoul? Why muſt expoſing the *Dean* to *popular odium* and *fury*, be my end? What overt-acts were there of ſuch a deſign? Did I miſrepreſent the *Dean* in any one inſtance? Or did I make it my buſineſs to carp at every little thing in his *Preface*? Did I inſiſt on far-fetcht conſequences, or force any undue ſenſe on his words? Did I ſpeak all I could to ſhew the Tendency of his *Preface*, or whole Book? Or did I take notice of any thing more than what was neceſſary for the clearing up the innocency of the Diſſenter? As to theſe particulars, you cannot faſten your Accuſation; But yet my aim muſt be expoſing the Dean; and why expoſing

posing him? What, was the *Dean* expos'd, because the charge with which he would load Dissenters, was such, that the very repeating and confuting it, tends to his Reproach? If so, whose fault is that?

I do freely confess, That I believe the *Deans* charge against Dissenters to be so indecent, that thereby he hath lost very much of that Esteem he formerly had among Judicious Gentlemen of the *Church* of *England*; but this is not my fault, nor an Argument, that what I wrote in the Defence of the Dissenter, was with a design of exposing the *Dean*. A thing I could have easily done, without either wresting his words, or imposing a forreign sense on 'em.

How easily could I have imitated the famous Bishop *Jewel*, and have pick'd such passages out of the *Dean*'s Discourses, as that *Great Prelate* did out of *Harding*, and have shewed how unlike himself the *Dean* acted, in contemning and pitying the Reverend Mr. *Baxter*, in comparing the judicious Mr. *Alsop*'s Discourse to the *Bird* of *Athens*, made up of Face and Feathers; and representing Mr. *Alsop* himself so, as if *all things had not been right*, that is, as if he had been mad. Of this I the rather take notice, because a very serious person on the reading the *Dean*'s Book, came to me on purpose, to enquire whether Mr. *Alsop* was never mad? If not, said he, Why did Dr. *Stillingfleet* write as if he had? Many other things of a more *uncomely* aspect I could have taken out of the *Dean*'s Writings, but I wav'd it, it not being my work in that *Enquiry*, or this *Reply*, to acquaint the World with the *nævi* of the *Reverend* Doctor; and therefore notwithstanding the many provocations you have given me in your *Defence of the Dean*, I'm resolved to treat the *Dean* more civilly than he did Mr. *B.* or Mr. *A.* or than you have Mr. *B.* or Mr. *H.* and the *Country Conformist*.

The exposing men to *Popular Odium* and *Fury*, becomes only such who hate *Persons* more than their *Opinions*, and who have little to offer against their Adversaries besides hard words. It becomes not men, who pretend to act suitably to the Christian Rule, to use railing Expressions instead of pungent Arguments; nor to expose the Person, instead of confuting his Opinion.

For this Reason I did in the *Modest and Peaceable Enquiry*, on a second perusal, expunge all such words as might seem hard or unmeet, treating the *Dean* with the *greatest Candour* and Respect,

not

not ſuffering one paſſage to go to the Preſs, that might tend to his reproach, unleſs rehearſing the charge lain in againſt the Diſſenter as cloath'd with his own words, and the confuting him, muſt be eſteem'd as ſuch.

'Tis true, I ſhew'd the *Tendency* of his Diſcourſe, which I thought to be for the advancing the *Papal Intereſt*. The very thing the Dean's Subſtitute drives at in the Dean's Defence, wherein our Author goes much further than the *Dean*, or at leaſt hath expreſſed his ſentiments more *freely*, and *with leſs caution*. But ſhall this be conſidered as an expoſing you to *popular odium and fury*? You aſſert, *That the Univerſal Church is a governed Society*; That *the Biſhops in their Colledg are the governing part*; That *the Biſhops conven'd in their Aſſembly, do not meet only for mutual* Help and Concord, *but for* Regiment. The Aſſembly of Biſhops in Council, is not ſuch as that of Princes of ſeveral diſtinct Territories, who meet together in order to the maintaining and conſerving a general Union and Peace in the World; for inſtance, that at *Nimmegen*, at which Convention the *Princes* come freely; and when there, the One is not under the *Regiment* of the Aſſembly, but each one free to Conſent or Diſſent to any thing propoſed for Peace, their Territories being as ſo many diſtinct Independent Governments, whoſe Governours are not accountable to any General Council of Princes in the World. Such an Aſſembly of Biſhops you are not for: For this, ſay you, p. 601. makes *Chriſtian* Communion as Arbitrary a thing, as the Confederacies of *Princes*; whereas the *Epiſcopal Office* is but *One*, and therefore ought to be adminiſtred by the *mutual Advice* and *Conſent of Biſhops*, who all equally ſhare in it; that is, the whole World muſt be conſidered as of *One* and the ſame *Government*; that the many particular Princes of diſtinct Territories, ſuch as *England*, *France*, *Spain*, *Denmark*, &c. are not *Independent* in their Government, but are accountable either unto *One Univerſal Emperour*, or *Diet*, &c. This is what you aſſert as to *Church-Government*, 'tis *One* all *the World over*. Though leſſer Societies are variouſly diſperſed, yet are all under one and the *ſame Government*, the Biſhops of the one and of the other are oblig'd to meet together in their *Colledge*, or *Diet*, where they are all bound to ſubmit unto the *Canons*, *Decrees*, or *Determinations* of the Colledge; that whoever diſſents

diſſents from the Body of the Colledge is Schiſmatical. ---This is your Notion, and for ought I know the *Deans*; a Notion that is the ſame with that of the *French* Papacy, that doth but fairly lead us to *Rome*.

But muſt the mentioning ſo much, expoſe you to the rage and fury of the people? If ſo, whom can you blame, but your ſelf? The like may be ſaid to the Dean, to whom I add this one requeſt, which is, to conſider the *Tendency* of his great Book, as well as of *this your Defence* of him; and if his *Aimes* and the *Tendency* of either of theſe Diſcourſes be different, 'twill be apparent that I was not miſtaken in my Charity of the Author, when I paſs'd my cenſure on his Treatiſe. However 'tis ſufficient, that the utmoſt I did was to expoſe the evil Tendency of the Book, endeavouring as much as poſſibly I could, to ſave the *Dean* from lying under Reproach, diſtinguiſhing between the Author and his Work.

This much may ſerve as more than enough to our *Author's Cenſure* of inviſible and unknown Deſigns.

CHAP. III.

A Reply to the Defence of the Dean of Paul's, *ſo far as it concerns the* Modeſt and Peaceable Enquiry.

SECT. I.

The Anſwer to what the Enquirer inſiſted on in ſhewing the Deans *Miſtakes about the Jeſuits Doctrine, concerning* Spiritual Prayer, *Examined.* § 1. *The preſent Aids of the Spirit in enabling Miniſters in the Exerciſe of their Function, agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of* England. *Dr.* Burnet's *moſt Chriſtian Reproof to ſuch Miniſters, as neglect the inward Motions of the Spirit.* § 2. *The Ground of the firſt Separation in Queen* Elizabeths *days, the very ſame with that of the firſt Reformation from* Popery, *beginning in* Henry *the 8th's time, and Sealed after with the Blood of our* Martyrs.

THE *Deans* Substitute doth at last apply himself to the *Defence of the Doctor*; in doing which he considers the *Reasons* I collected out of the *Dean's Preface*, which the *Dean* urges to engage the Reader to believe, that the Dissenters are a people carrying on the *Popish Designs*.

1. *The Dissenters have embraced the Jesuits Principles about Spiritual Prayer, and a more pure way of Worship.* This is what I observ'd out of Dr. *Still*. But our *Author*, who hath read over the Doctors Preface very carefully, can find no such thing urged against the Dissenters, and adds, *All that Mr.* Lobb *founds this Accusation on, is, That the* Dean *says, It is not improbable that the Jesuits were the first setters up of Spiritual Prayer in* England: And then goes on to a very decent Censure, saying, *That this is mighty falsely and imperfectly represented.*

Sir, If I had insisted on no more than what you here mention as the foundation of my Charge, I must acknowledg, that 'twould not only be imperfectly, but impertinently related: For what connexion is there between the *Jesuits Practises*, and their *Principles*?

Is it not well known, that the Principles they profess, the Doctrines they embrace concerning many a point in Divinity, are one thing, even when their Practice is another? May they not then, in order to the carrying on a further Design, set on *Practices* contrary to their *Doctrines*? Yea, surely they may; and this is the whole Defence you make in behalf of the *Dean*, with which after an unnecessary Harangue, you dismiss the Subject.

But is this fair, to misrepresent an Adversary, and then confute what needs no Confutation? Doth this redound to the Honour of *a Presbyter of the Church of* England? Was this all on which Mr. *Lobb founded his Accusation*? Did he not add somewhat more than what you relate? You say, all that Mr. *Lobb* founds this accusation on is, that the Dean says, *It is not improbable that the* Jesuits *were the first setters up of* Spiritual Prayer *in* England; *which is mighty falsely and imperfectly repesented.* p. 6. Yet whoever will consult the *Enquiry* will find, that I do out of the Dean add, *That there is no improbality of the thing, if we consider the Dissenters pretences about Spiritual Prayer, to the Doctrine*

ctrine and Practice of the Jeſuits. The Dean ſuggeſts, that Spiritual and Free Prayer, even that Spiritual and Free Prayer about which there is ſuch a Pother, is ſuited to the *Doctrines* of the Jeſuits; to the Doctrine, that is, to their *Principles.* What difference is there between the Doctrine and the Principles of the *Church* of *England?* In like manner I Query, What difference is there between the *Doctrines* and *Principles* of the Jeſuits? Doth the *Dean* then aſſert ſuch an Agreement to be between the *Pretences* of the Diſſenter about Spiritual Prayer, and the *Doctrines* or *Principles* of the Jeſuits, not only the Practices but *Doctrines* of the Jeſuits? Who then is the imperfect or miſtaken Reporter?

The *Dean's* Charge againſt Diſſenters is, That the Diſſenters pretences about Spiritual Prayer, are ſuited with the Doctrines of the Jeſuits. And 'tis our concern to enquire after the truth of this Charge; I ſay of this charge; to wit, about the *Agreeableneſs* that is between our *Pretences* and their *Doctrines.* For it is no way momentous to enquire after the practice of a company of Villains, who can transform themſelves into a thouſand ſhapes, whenever their Intereſt obliges them to do ſo. Was it never known that a Papiſt crept into ſome great Preferment in the *Church* of *England*, at which time they did both Aſſent and Conſent to the doctrines of the *Church* of *England*? What think you of a *quondam* Biſhop of *Gloceſter*, to mention no more? did he not ſpeak well of the *Church* of *England*, yea even of the *Proteſtant* Religion? Is it therefore Popery?

For this Reaſon it concerns me not to enquire after thoſe Stories inſiſted on by the Doctor, or to be found in that Pamphlet called *Foxes and Firebrands.* The great Enquiry muſt be after the *Doctrines* of the Jeſuit, whether there is any ſuitableneſs between the *Diſſenters* pretences and the *Jeſuits Doctrines.* For which Reaſon the Jeſuits Writings were conſulted, and the Doctor's Charge found *untrue*; the Dr. being *miſtaken* as to *matter of fact.* He repreſented the Jeſuits Doctrines to be other than indeed they are, which, to ſpeak ſoftly, was a *Miſtake.*

If the *Deans Defender* would have ſpoke to the purpoſe, He ſhould have ſearched thoſe places I inſiſted on in *Azorius*, *Filiucius*, and *Bellarmine*, and have ſhewed wherein I had either made a falſe report of their ſayings, or miſinterpreted 'em. But this was impoſſible.

There being nothing else of moment in the Reply to what I offered against the *Dean* about *Spiritual Prayer*, I might fairly, without saying any thing more, proceed to the next particular. But seeing some have spoken contemptibly of the *Spirit of prayer*, which is said to assist such as use *free* or *extempore prayer*, as if those who spake of receiv'd help from the Spirit in prayer, were *Enthusiastical*, &c. and because our Author talks as if the Jesuits had the first hand in the *Separation of the old Nonconformists from the Church of England*, crying down the Common-prayers as a dull, formal, superstitious Worship, and the setting up *free prayer* in the room of it; I will shew,

1. The sense of the *first Reformers* about the *aid of the Spirit*.

And 2. What was the great and chief ground of the *First Separation*.

§ 1. Concerning the *Aid of the Holy Spirit*, by which many are enabled to *pray freely or spiritually*, it hath been by some of the Conforming Ministers asserted, That such as pretend to receive the aid of the Spirit, may as well pretend to inspiration, *&c.* That then they'l believe that persons can pray by the Spirit, when they hear the unlearned can pray in *Latin*, *Greek*, or in some other *unknown language*; as if the *aids the Spirit* affords unto such as pray freely, had been *extraordinary*, &c.

This I cannot but consider, as what doth very much reflect on the *Dispensation of the Spirit*, to the great dishonour of true Christian Religion. For such is the present state of *true Religion*, that whoever speaks contemptibly of the *Spirits Aid*, must be esteemed not only a Despiser of the first Reformers, but of that part of the present Constitution to which our *Clergy* on their entrance into their Function are *principally concern'd*.

1. Tis well known that what the first *Reformers* did in the Reforming the *Liturgy*, was by the *Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons assembled in Parliament*, recorded to have been done by the *Aid of the Holy Ghost*.

The Parliament in K. *Edward*'s days passing an Act for the confirmation of the *Publick Liturgy* in the preamble thereof, declare, *That those who drew up that Order of Divine Worship*, did it by *the Aid of the Holy Ghost*. 'Tis true this expression could not escape the censure of such as were Popishly affected; they thinking

thinking it too much that it was ſaid, the Book was drawn by the *aid of the Holy Ghoſt*, as if the import of thoſe expreſſions had been nothing leſs than that thoſe *perſons concern'd in the drawing it up*, had been *extraordinarily inſpir'd*. But 'twas well anſwer'd by ſuch as ſaid, That it muſt not be *ſo* underſtood; that 'twas only to be taken in that ſenſe as *all good motions and conſultations* are directed or aſſiſted by the ſecret influences of Gods H. Spirit, which doth often help good men, even in their imperfect actions, where the good that is done is juſtly aſcrib'd to the grace of God. For this conſult that truly Judicious and Deſerving Dr. *Burnet* in his *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, Part 2. lib. 1. p. 94. The ſame that is ſaid of this expreſſion when applied to the firſt Compoſers of the Divine Service, may be ſaid of ſuch as are aſſiſted in *free prayer* by the *ſecret Influences of the Holy Spirit*. Moreover,

2. The *Clergy at their Ordination* were to receive the *Holy Ghoſt*. In King *Edward*'s days, whenever a *Biſhop*, or *Prieſt* was Ordained, 'twas ſaid, *Receive thou the Holy Ghoſt in the Name of the Father*, &c. But to what purpoſe, if not to *aid* and *aſſiſt them* in the diſcharge of their Miniſterial Function, *viz.* in *Prayer*, in *Preaching*, in *giving private Admonitions*, and *Exhortations*? &c. Hence I argue, The Spirit accordingly is given them, or not. If not, no wonder they reproach its work, and gracious Influences, to ſay no more? But if they do at their Ordination receive a plentiful portion of the Spirit, how can they talk ſo much againſt the *Aſſiſtances* thereof, vouchſafed to others? What, is it confin'd unto the Clergy only, or unto the Epiſcopal Clergy, that none without *canting* muſt mention One word of the Spirit? But

3. 'Tis ſurprizing, that any of our Clergy ſhould ſpeak any thing againſt the *ſecret motions of Gods Spirit*; for ſurely ſuch of them as are juſt, and true, and faithful to God, and their own ſouls, have *actually felt* ſo much of the *Internal* workings of the *Holy Ghoſt on their ſouls*, that they were thereby quickned, and moved to enter on the work of the Miniſtry. Thus 'tis with them, or at leaſt, they are conſcientiouſly perſwaded of as much; and can ſuch as have felt the power of the Holy Ghoſt on their own hearts, ſpeak evil of the Aſſiſtance it affords unto others? That the honeſt among the Epiſcopal Clergy are ſuch as know what *'tis to be moved by the Holy Spirit*, as they them-

themſelves truſt, is evident from the anſwer they give to the queſtion propos'd to them, when they are preſented to Orders, which is, *Do you truſt that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghoſt to take upon you this Office and Miniſtration to ſerve God for the promoting his glory, and for the edifying his people?* To which the anſwer is, *He truſts he is.*

It may be ſome may inquire, How comes it to paſs then that ſo many of the *Clergy* thus ordained, do not only neglect their own work, but by their *uncomely diſcourſes* reflect on this very ſpirit? To this no other anſwer but that of the *Learned* and *Pious* Dr. *Burnet* ſhall be given, who in his *Hiſt. of the Reformation*, Par. 2. l. p. 145. thus expreſſeth himſelf: 'It has been oft lamented, that 'many come to receive Orders before they have ſeriouſly read o-'ver theſe Queſtions, and examined themſelves whether they 'could with a good conſcience make the Anſwers there preſcri-'bed; ſince it is ſcarce credible that men of common honeſty 'would *lye* in the preſence of God on ſo great an occaſion; and 'yet 'tis too viſible, that many have not any ſuch inward voca-'tion, nor have ever conſidered ſeriouſly what it is. If it were 'well apprehended, that heat that many have to get into Or-'ders would ſoon abate, who perhaps have nothing in their eye 'but ſome place of Profit, or Benefice, to which way muſt be 'made by that preceding Ceremony; and ſo enter into Orders 'as others are aſſociated into Fraternities and Corporations, 'with little previous ſenſe of that Holy Character they are to 'receive, when they thus dedicate their Lives and Labours to 'the Service of God in the Goſpel. In the *Primitive Church* the 'apprehenſion of this made even good and holy men afraid to 'enter under ſuch bonds; and therefore they were often to be 'drag'd almoſt by force, or catcht at unawares, and be ſo ini-'tiated; as appears in the Lives of theſe two *Greek* Fathers, '*Nazianzen* and *Chryſoſtome*. If men make their *firſt ſtep* to 'the Holy Altar by ſuch a *lye*, as is their pretending to a *motion* '*of the Holy Ghoſt*, concerning which *they know little*, but that 'they have nothing at all of it, they have no reaſon to expect 'that Bleſſing which otherwiſe attends on ſuch Dedications. And 'it had been happy for the Church if all thoſe that are autho-'riz'd to confer Orders, had ſtood on this more critically, and 'not been contented with a bare putting theſe Queſtions to

'thoſe

'thoſe who come to be Ordain'd, but had uſed a due ſtrictneſs 'before-hand, ſutable to that grave admonition of St. *Paul* to *Ti-* 'mothy, *Lay hands ſuddenly on no man, and be not partakers of* 'other mens ſins.

How would the Church have flouriſh'd if this worthy Drs. counſel had been both given and taken at the beginning of the Reformation! If all that entred on the Miniſtry had felt the mighty power of the Spirit in turning them from darkneſs to light, from the power of Satan unto God! How would they have labour'd for the converſion and edification of their hearers! The which work could not proſper in their hands, but ſuch as were born of God, receiving the Spirit, would have been enabled by it to cry *Abba Father*. *Spiritual* and *free prayer* would have been from the beginning ſo *well known*, that the ſuggeſting it to have been *Jeſuitical*, would with the greateſt contempt and ſcorn be rejected; and thoſe many raſh and *indecent epithetes* given it, would have been conſider'd but as the overtacts of ill-will to the Reformation of the Church of *England*.

§. II. The *Account our Author gives of the firſt Separation*, is very unrrue. For, 1. It was not the laying aſide All *forms of prayer*, that the old *Nonconformiſts* preſt hard for. They were for the amending the *Liturgy*, but not for the removing all Liturgies. 'Tis true in K. *Edward*'s days there was a conteſt between *Hooper* and *Ridley*, &c. about the old Popiſh Veſtments, but not about Forms of Prayer. In Queen *Maries* days at *Franckfort* there were great contentions among ſome of them, who before had uſed the *Engliſh Liturgy*, but not that thoſe who were againſt the uſe of the *Engliſh Liturgy* at that time, were againſt it as it was a *Form of Prayer*, but they apprehended that they being in foreign parts, they ſhould rather accommodate their worſhip to thoſe among whom they liv'd; whence inſtead of the *Engliſh Liturgy*, they uſed one near the *Geneva* and *French* Forms. Moreover in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, even long after the Separation, the old *Nonconformiſts* declar'd, that they look'd on *Forms of Prayer* to be lawful. It may be they were griev'd to ſee Q. *Elizabeths Biſhops* to entertain more favourable thoughts of the *Pope* than thoſe bleſſed *Martyrs*, *Cranmer*, and *Ridley* did, as is to be ſeen by their expunging out of Q. *Elizabeth's* Liturgy what was offenſive to the Pope in K. *Edward*'s;

but

but againſt Forms they were not; or it may be they could not approve of any that would *quench the motions of the Spirit* they profeſſed to have felt before their *Ordination*, whether in truſting unto it for help in the exerciſe of Prayer, or any other parts of their work. But to cry down all *Forms* in order to the ſetting up *ſpiritual* and *free prayer* inſtead of the *Liturgy*, and for this reaſon to ſeparate from the *Church of England*, is more than can be proved.

2. The *great* and *principal* reaſon of the *Separation* of the old *Nonconformiſts*, was occaſion'd by their preſſing towards that *Reformation* expreſly aim'd at by our *Engliſh Reformers* in *H.* 8.'s time, for the which they were burnt in *Smithfield* and *elſewhere*. Whoever would underſtand the true Reaſon of the firſt *Separation* in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, muſt enquire after the *firſt Reformation* deſir'd in *H.* 8.'s.

In *Henry* 8*th*'s days, that wickedneſs that ſpread it ſelf throughout the Weſtern part of the World, ſadly prevail'd in theſe Northern parts. This part of the earth was in an eſpecial manner troubled with a vicious and ſenſual *Clergy*, whoſe example had a ſad influence on the *Common people*. The offſpring of a lewd vicious Clergy, was a profane and extremely wicked Laity; ſo that if ever, it might *now* be truly ſaid, *The whole world lay in wickedneſs*.

This being the ſtate of the *Clergy* and *Laity*, the fear of God and all true Religion almoſt loſt, it pleaſed the Father of mercies to open the eyes of ſome, to ſhew 'em the evil of the times, &c. *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, and others beyond the ſeas, and *Tindal*, *Frith*, *Barns*, &c. here in *England*. Theſe Worthies being deeply ſenſible of the Abominations of the times in which they liv'd, made diligent ſearch after the cauſes thereof, in order to the carrying on a Reformation, *&c.* In which enquiry, they found the *viciouſneſs* of the people to be occaſioned by the *ſenſuality* and *lewdneſs* of the *Clergy*; the *lewdneſs* of the *Clergy* to be the product of an *uninſtituted Hierarchy*, which was rather adjuſted for Worldly grandure than the glory of God.

The great cauſe of all thoſe Miſchiefs was the want of ſtrict and Scriptural Diſcipline, which (as it had *not* been in due exerciſe ſince the firſt degeneracy from the Apoſtolical Inſtitution and Primitive Practice, even ſo) could not be faithfully exerciſed

ciſed, but by being *reduced to its antient ſtate.* For which Reaſon *Tyndall* applies himſelf to the work, and ſo did the famous *Lambert* and Doctor *Barnes.* All which I will from good Authority evince.

1. Mr. *Tyndall*, a bleſſed *Martyr* burnt at *Brabant* for his firm adhering to the *Truths of the Goſpel*, doth in thoſe Diſcourſes of his publiſhed by Mr. *Fox* ſhew, that the many Abominations of his Times proceeded from the viciouſneſs of a *Proud*, *Covetous*, & *Senſual Clergy*, who having forſaken the *Apoſtolical Rule*, in proceſs of time through the Bounty of ſome wealthy perſons, who had embraced the Chriſtian Religion, and divers other ways, got an *abundance of Riches*, which occaſioned their *Pride* and *Luxury*, to the ruine of the true Religion: Thus in that Treatiſe of *The Obedience of a Chriſtian man*, 'There is no Miſchiefs or Diſor-'ders (ſaith he) whether it be in the Temporal Regiment, or 'in the Spiritual, whereof they [i. e. *The Spirituality, the Clergy*] 'are not the chief Cauſes, and even the very Fountain and 'Spring, and as we ſay, the *Well-head:* So that 'tis impoſſible to 'Preach againſt Miſchief, except thou begin at *them*; or to ſet 'any Reformation in the world, except thou *Reform them firſt.* This ſame Mr. *Tyndall* in another place ſhews us, how they occaſioned ſo much miſchief, in theſe words, 'But after that the 'Devil was broke looſe, and the *Biſhops* began to purchaſe, and 'the *Deacons* to ſcratch all to them, and the Spirituality to 'climb on high, then becauſe the *Labour*, [*viz.* of examining and confirming the Adult, who had been Baptized in their Infancy] 'ſeemed too tedious and painful, they neglected it. *Tyndal* of *Sacraments and Ceremonies.*

The *Clergy* growing rich, labour'd that their *Honour* might equalize their *Wealth*, which was followed with *Idleneſs*, a Neglect of God and their Duty. Hence Preaching is let down, the *Ceremonies* being eſteem'd as the moſt effectual means of Inſtruction. This occaſions the multiplication of ſignificant Ceremonies, which was the great Reaſon of the dreadful *Ignorance*, into which the whole *European* world was plundg'd, when *Popery* prevail'd. So Mr. *Tyndall*, 'I impute this our grievous fall into 'ſo extream and horrible Blindneſs (wherein we are ſo deep 'and ſo deadly brought aſleep) unto nothing ſo much, as unto 'the *multitude of Ceremonies*; for aſſoon as the *Prelats* had ſet

'up such a rabble of Ceremonies, they thought it superfluous to 'teach the plain Text any longer, and the Law of God, Faith 'of Christ, &c. forasmuch as all such things were *play'd* before 'the peoples faces daily in the Ceremonies, &c. Tyndall *of the Ceremonies of the Mass.*

Thus 'tis evident, that in *Henry* the 8ths *time* the great wickedness of that Age was grievous to such as aim'd at *Reformation*; that these wickednesses were occasion'd by the Pride, Covetousness, and Sensuality of the rich Clergy. But

2. 'Tis as manifest, That the *Pride* of the Clergy was discovered by their *Prelacy*, their aspiring after a *Dominoon* over their *Brethren.* Whence the One gets the name of *Bishop* appropriated unto him, and with that name an *Unaccountable*, yea an *Unscriptural Power.* So Mr. *Tyndall* in his *Practice of Prelates*; 'The Office of a Bishop was a roume at the beginning that no 'man coveted, and that no man durst take upon him, save he 'that loved Jesus Christ better than his own Life. For as Christ 'saith, That no man might be his Disciple, except that he were 'ready to forsake Life, and all: Even so might that Officer be 'sure, that it might cost him his Life at one time or another, 'for bearing record unto the Truth. But after that the multitude of the Christians were encreased, and many great men 'had received the Faith, then both Lands and Rents, as well as 'other Goods, were given unto the maintenance as well of the 'Clergy, as of the Poor; because they gave then no Tythes 'to the Priests, nor yet now do, save in certain Countries. For 'it is too much to give Alms, Offerings, Lands, and Tythes 'also. And then *the Bishops made them Substitutes under them to 'help them, which they called Priests, and kept the name of Bishops 'to themselves.*

'But out of the *Deacons* sprang all the *Mischief.* For through 'their hands went all things, they ministred unto the Clergy, 'they ministred unto the Poor, they were in favour with great 'and small. And when the *Bishops Office began to have rest and 'be Honourable*, then the *Deacons* through Favour and Gifts 'climbed up thereunto, as lightly as he that hath the old *Abbots 'Treasure succeedeth with us.* And by the means of their practice and 'acquaintance in the world, they were more subtle and worldly 'wise than the old Bishops, and less learned in Gods word, as our

Prelates

'*Prelates* are, when they come from Stewardſhips in Gentlemens 'Houſes, and from ſurveying of great mens Lands, *&c.* '——Then, while they that had the Plow by the tail, looked 'back, the *Plow went awry, Faith waxed feeble and faint, Love* '*waxed cold, the Scripture waxed dark, Chriſt was no more ſeen*; 'He was in the Mount with *Moſes*, and therefore the *Biſhops* 'would have a *God upon the earth*, whom they might ſee; and 'thereupon they began to diſpute who ſhould be greateſt. So far Mr. *Tyndal* in his *Practice of Popiſh Prelates.*

3. The Malady, and Diſeaſe of thoſe times, with their Cauſes, were no ſooner underſtood, but ſeveral *Worthy Perſons* applied themſelves to a diligent ſearch after the moſt proper Remedy, and found, that a *Reformation* muſt begin among the *Clergy*, that all *things muſt be reduc'd to the Apoſtolical Inſtitution. Diſcipline muſt be ſtrictly exerciſed*, the which could not with effect be accompliſhed, but by bringing all things to the firſt Inſtitution; For which reaſon, Mr. *Tyndall* makes his enquiry after thoſe *Officers* the *Apoſtles ordain'd* in *Chriſts Church*, and what their *Offices* were, concerning which take Mr. *Tyndal*'s own ſenſe, in his diſcourſe of the Practice of *Popiſh Prelates*. '——Wherefore the 'Apoſtles (ſaith he) following, and obeying the Rule, Doctrine, 'and Commandment of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, ordained in his 'Kingdom, and Congregation, *Two Officers*: One called after the '*Greek* word, *Biſhop*, in *Engliſh*, an *Overſeer*, which ſame was 'called *Prieſt* after the *Greek*, *Elder* in *Engliſh*, becauſe of his Age, 'Diſcretion, and ſadneſs; for he was as nigh as could be, always 'an *Elderly man.* And this *Overſeer* hath put his hands unto the 'Plow of Gods Word, and fed Chriſts Flock, and tended them 'only, without looking unto any other buſineſs in the world. A-'nother *Officer* they choſe, and called him *Deacon*, after the *Greek*; 'a *Miniſter* in *Engliſh*, *to miniſter the alms of the people unto the* '*poor and needy.* For in the Congregation of Chriſt, love maketh 'every mans gifts and goods common unto the neceſſity of his 'neighbour. Wherefore the love of God being yet hot in the 'hearts of men, the rich that had the ſubſtance of this worlds 'goods, brought of their abundance great plenty unto the ſu-'ſtentation of the poor, and delivered it unto the hands of the 'Deacons.

Mr. *Tyndall* judg'd, that according to the *Apoſtolical Inſtitution*, there were no other Officers in the Church but *Elders* and *Deacons*. The *Elders* being of the ſame Office and Order with the *Biſhops*, they being two names belonging to one and the ſame *perſon*. 'There is (ſaith he) Presbuteros *called an Elder by Birth*, 'which ſame called immediately a Biſhop *or* Overſeer *to declare what* 'Perſons are meant——*they were called* Elders, *becauſe of their Age*, 'Gravity, &c. *and* Biſhops *and* Overſeers *by reaſon of their* Offices. 'And all that were called Elders or Prieſts (if they ſo will) were 'called Biſhops *alſo, though they have* divided the names now, 'which thing thou mayeſt evidently ſee by the firſt Chap. of Titus, 'and the 20th. of the Acts——*Thoſe* Overſeers, *which we now call* 'Biſhops after the Greek word, were alway biding in one place to 'Govern the Congregation *there*. (Tyndal of the word Elder.) *But* 'Deacons were Overſeers of the Poor and crept not into Orders 'till the Church grew Rich.

Tyndal was not alone in this opinion, it being alſo the ſenſe of Famous *Lambert* and Dr. *Barns*, who ſtrenuouſly defended, and at the laſt ſealed this *Truth* with their *blood*. One of the Articles for which they were burnt, being about the *Order of Prieſthood*.

I'le give you in the firſt place *Lambert*'s own anſwer to the ninth Article, as I find it in *Acts and Mon. Vol.* 2. 'As touching 'Prieſthood (ſaith *Lambert*) in the *Primitive Church*, when virtue 'bare (as ancient Doctors do deem, and Scripture in mine opi-'nion recordeth the ſame) the moſt room, there were no 'more Officers in the Church of God than *Biſhops* and *Deacons*; 'that is to ſay, Miniſters; as witneſſeth, beſide Scripture, full 'apertly *Hierome* in his Commentaries upon the *Epiſtles* of *Paul*; 'whereas he ſaith, That thoſe that we call *Prieſts*, were all one, 'and no other but *Biſhops*; and the *Biſhops* none other but *Prieſts*, 'men ancient both in Age and Learning, ſo near as they could 'be choſen. Neither were they inſtitute and choſen as they be 'now-adays, with ſmall regard of a *Biſhop* or his *Officer*, only ap-'poſing them if they can conſtrue a Collect; but they were 'choſen not only of the Biſhop, but alſo with the *conſent of the* 'people among whom they ſhou'd have their living, as ſheweth 'Saint *Cyprian*; and the *people* (as he ſaith) ought *to have power* 'to chuſe their prieſts, that be men of good Learning, of good and ho-

neſt

'*neſt report*: but alack for pity, ſuch *Elections* are now baniſhed, 'and new faſhions brought in, which if we ſhould confer with 'the form of the *Election* ſhewed of Chriſt by his Apoſtle *Paul*, 'we ſhould find no ſmall diverſity; but all turned upſide down. 'To conclude, I ſay, the *Order* or *ſtate* of *Prieſts* and *Deacons*, 'was ordained by God; but *Subdeacons* and *Conjurers*, otherwiſe 'called *Exorciſtæ*, or *Acolitæ*, which we call *Benet* and *Collect*, 'were inſtituted by the invention of men; and this you may 'find in the Law, *Diſt.* 21. and other places, where it is writ-'ten, *Subdiaconatus tempore Apoſtolorum non fuit ſacer.* Subdea-'conſhip in the time of the Apoſtles was no holy Order.

Dr. *Barns* in like manner had the ſame objected againſt him in the Articles for which he was burned. I'le give you the Article, and his own ſentiments concerning it, as Mr. *Fox* relates in a Diſcourſe ſet forth with Mr. *Tyndal* and *John Frith*'s Works.

Article 6. 'I will never believe, nor yet I can never believe, 'that one man may be by the Law of God a Biſhop of two or 'three Cities, yea of an whole Countrey; for it is contrary to 'Saint *Paul*, which ſaith, *I have left thee behind, to ſet in every 'City a Biſhop.* And if you find in one place of Scripture that 'they be called *Epiſcopi*, you ſhall find in many that they be call-'ed *Presbyteri.*——I was brought before my Lord *Cardinal* in-'to his Gallery, and there he read all my Articles till he came to 'this, and there he ſtopped, and ſaid, That this touched him, 'and therefore he asked me, if I thought it wrong that *one Bi-'ſhop* ſhould have *ſo many Cities* underneath him? Unto whom 'I anſwered, That I could no farther go than to St. *Paul*'s text, 'which ſet in every City a *Biſhop*. Then asked he me, If I 'thought it now unright (ſeeing the Ordinance of the Church) 'that one Biſhop ſhould have ſo many Cities? I anſwered, That 'I knew none Ordinance of the Church (as concerning this 'thing) but St. *Paul*'s ſaying only. Nevertheleſs I did ſee a con-'trary cuſtom and practiſe in the world, but I know not the *O-'riginal* thereof. Then ſaid he, That in the Apoſtles time there 'were divers *Cities*, ſome ſeven miles, ſome ſix miles long, and 'over them was there ſet but one *Biſhop*, and of their Suburbs 'alſo; ſo likewiſe now a *Biſhop* hath alſo but One City to his

Cathe-

'*Cathedral Church*, and the Countrey about it as *Suburbs* unto it. 'Methought this was far-fetcht, but I durſt not deny it, becauſe 'it was ſo great Authority, and of ſo holy a *Father*, and of ſo 'great a Divine. But this I dare ſay, that his Holineſs could 'never prove it by Scripture, nor yet by any *Authority of Do-'ctors*, nor yet by any practiſe of the Apoſtles; and yet it 'muſt be true, becauſe a *Pillar of the Church hath ſpoken it*. But 'let us ſee what the *Doctors* ſay to mine Article. *Athanaſius* 'doth declare this Text of the Apoſtle, *I have left thee behind*, '&c. He would not commit unto one *Biſhop* a whole Ylde, but 'he did injoyn that every *City* ſhould have his *proper Paſtor*, ſup-'poſing that by this means they ſhould more diligently *overſee* 'the people, and alſo that the labour ſhould be more eaſie to 'bear, *&c.* Alſo *Chryſoſtome* on that ſame Text: He would not 'that a whole Countrey ſhould be permitted unto one man, but 'he enjoined to every man his Cure, by that means he knew 'that his labour ſhould be more eaſie, and the ſubjects ſhould be 'with more diligence govern'd, if the Teachers were not di-'ſtract with the governing of many Churches, but had cure and 'charge of *one Church only*, &c. Methinks theſe be plain words, 'and able to move a man to ſpeak as much as I did. But grant 'that you may have all theſe Cities, yet can you make it none '*Hereſie*. For my Lord *Cardinal* granted that it was but *againſt 'him*, and againſt *you*, which be no *Gods*. But I poor man muſt 'be an Heretick, there is no remedy, You will have it ſo, and 'who is able to ſay nay? *Not all Scripture*, nor yet *God him-'ſelf*.

By this time the *Reader* cannot but be well ſatisfied, that the great thing aim'd at by the firſt great Lights *England* had in *Henry* the 8ths days, as a moſt effectual way to carry on a Reformation, was the reducing the *Popiſh Hierarchy* to an *Apoſtolical Presbytery*. The Presbyterian Diſcipline, that is, *The Government of Goſpel-Churches by Presbyters and Deacons, being of Divine Inſtitution, is moſt admirably ſuited to the deſigned End of promoting the Glory of God, the Power of Religion*, &c. *A Diſcipline*, the truth of which hath been ſealed by *the blood of bleſſed Proteſtant Martyrs*, a thing in which our *Epiſcoparians* cannot make their boaſt.

4. The

Moreover *'tis manifeſt, that this was not only the apprehenſion of* Tindall, Barnes, *and* Lambert, *but that all the Clergy* in *Henry* the 8*ths* time, denied a *Dioceſan Epiſcopacy* to be of *Divine Inſtitution*, aſſerting, that in the New Teſtament there is no mention made but of Deacons or Miniſters, and Prieſts or Biſhops. This is in a Paper ſign'd by *Cromwell*, and many others; Yea, and in the *neceſſary Erudition of a Chriſtian man*, as is acknowledged by the *Judicious Dr. Burnet*, who in his *Addenda* to the *firſt part of the Reformation*, doth ſay, *That both in this Writing, and in the neceſſary Erudition of a Chriſtian man, Biſhops and Prieſts are ſpoken of as one and the ſame Office.* Though I muſt confeſs, that the Dr. doth differ from thoſe Divines; and although he gives us not ſatisfaction in his Reply, yet he ſpeaks more ingenuouſly, and more to the purpoſe, than either this Gentleman, or Dr. *Stillingfleet* himſelf.

4. The old *Nonconformiſts* in Queen *Elizabeths* days agreeing with thoſe worthy Martyrs, *Tyndall*, *Lambert*, and *Barnes*, concerning the moſt effectual way of carrying on the Reformation, applied themſelves ſeriouſly to the Work. The Viciouſneſs of ſome of the Clergy in Queen *Elizabeths* days was as grievous unto the Nonconformiſt, as unto thoſe glorious Martyrs; a Reformation in Manners, and in order thereunto in *Church-Diſcipline*, was what they aim'd at.

'Tis very evident, That a further *Reformation* than was carried on by Queen *Elezabeth*, was very *deſirable*; for in ſome reſpects ſhe carried it not ſo far as King *Edward* himſelf had done. 'For Queen *Elizabeth* (as Dr. *Burnet* moſt admirably expreſſeth it) *though ſhe had been bred up from her Infancy with a Hatred to the Papacy, and a Love to the Reformation; yet as her firſt Impreſſions in her Fathers Reign were in favour of ſuch old Rites, as he had ſtill retained, ſo in her nature ſhe loved State and ſome Magnificence in Religion, as well as in every thing elſe: She thought that in her Brothers Reign they had ſtript it too much of external Ornaments, and had made their Doctrine too narrow in ſome Points: Therefore ſhe intended to have ſome things explain'd in more general Terms, that ſo all Parties might be comprehended by them: She inclin'd to keep up Images in Churches, and to have the manner of Chriſt's Preſence in the Sacrament left in ſome general words, that thoſe who believe a Corporal Preſence, might not be driven away*

away from the Church by too nice an explanation of it. Hiſtory of Reform. part. 2. l. 3.

As to this laſt Particular, the *Rubrick* that explain'd the Reaſon for the kneeling at the Sacrament, That thereby no Adoration is intended to any corporal preſence of Chriſts fleſh and blood, becauſe that is only in Heaven; which had been in King *Edwards* Liturgy, is left out, and kneeling at the Sacrament, to many a Proteſtant much more offenſive than formerly.

The great Propenſion in Queen *Elizabeth*'s days to gain over the *Popiſh* party to her Communion by thoſe Alterations made in the Liturgy in favour of the Papiſt, the ordering the Sacramental Bread to be made round in the faſhion of the Wafers uſed in the time of Queen *Mary*, the requiring the *Table* to be placed where the *Altar* ſtood, *&c.* was attended with the *Conformity* of many, who were cordially affected to the Intereſt of the Church of *Rome*, at which time there was not a ſufficient number of learned men to ſupply the *Cures*; which filled the Church (as *Heylin* ſaith) with an *Ignorant and Illiterate Clergy, whoſe learning went no further than the Liturgy, or Book of Homilies, though* otherwiſe conformable unto the Rules of the Church.

The *Old Nonconformiſts ſtill* deſiring a further Reformation than was carried on in King *Edwards days*, but finding rather a turning toward *Rome*, could not but be greatly grieved. They in their places wait a while, but at length humbly deſire a *Parochial Diſcipline*, inſtead of which they fall under the laſh of new *Impoſitions*, unto which they could not Conſciencioufly conform; hence many *Learned, Judicious, Godly and Faithful Miniſters* are caſt out, even at ſuch a time when the *Church* had but a company of Illiterate Fellows to officiate in Publick. From whence proceedeth the *Firſt Separation*, as appears from what the old *Smith* ſaid in his Anſwer to the Biſhop of *London*'s charge, where you will find, that although they ſeparated from the *Church*, becauſe their faithful Miniſters were turn'd out, yet they even then made it manifeſt, That they left not the Liturgy, becauſe it contain'd Forms of Prayer, for they made uſe of *a Form at their Separate Meeting.* Take *Smith's* words in a part of the *Regiſter*. 'Indeed as you ſaid even now, for Preaching 'and miniſtring the Sacraments, ſo long as we might have the 'Word

'Word freely Preached, and the Sacraments administred with-
'out the preferring of Idolatrous gear about it, we never aſ-
'ſembled together in Houſes. But when it came to this point,
'that all our Preachers were diſplaced by your Law, that
'would not ſubſcribe to your Apparel and your Law; ſo that
'we could not hear none of them in any *Church* by the ſpace of
'ſeven or eight weeks, except Father *Coverdale*, of whom we
'have a good opinion; and yet God knows the man was ſo
'fearful, that he durſt not be known unto us where he Prea-
'ched, though we ſought it at his houſe. And then were we
'troubled and commanded to your Courts from day to day,
'for not coming to your Pariſh-Churches. Then we bethought
'us what were beſt to do; and we remembred that there was a
'*Congregation* of us in this City in Queen *Marys* days; and a
'Congregation at *Geneva*, which uſed a *Book*, and *Order* of
'Preaching, *Miniſtring of the Sacraments and Diſcipline, moſt*
'*agreeable to the Word of God:* which Book is allowed by that
'*Godly and Well-learned man*, *Mr.* Calvin, and the Preachers
'there, which Book and Order we now hold. And if you can
'reprove this Book, or any thing that we hold by the Word of
'God, we will yield to you, and do open Penance at *Paul's*
'Croſs; if not, we will ſtand to it by the Grace of God.

Thus no Parochial Diſcipline being admitted, but thoſe who deſir'd it being Ejected, even at ſuch a time, when thoſe who remain'd in Publick for the moſt part were Illiterate and Vicious, *the Separation begun. The Ejection of the Godly Non Conformiſts, the Senſuality of the remaining Clergy*, was a great Cauſe of the *firſt Separation*, and not without great Reaſon. For it being as *eſſential* to every true *Goſpel-Miniſter*, that he *Govern* the *Church* of which he is a Paſtor, as that he *teaches* and inſtructs it; the taking from 'em ſo *eſſential* a part of their Office, which by woful experience has been of a very ill tendency, could not but occaſion the *Old Nonconformiſts* to manifeſt their diſlike to ſuch proceedings, and refuſe the giving in an *Aſſent* and *Conſent thereunto*; for which *Refuſal* they being *Ejected*, the *multitude of ſuch* as remain'd being Illiterate, yea and Vicious in their Converſations, the more ſober People withdrew from the *Publick*, and run after the Ejected. The Scandals of the Clergy having had no inconſiderable influence on the Separation.

For which consult the Learned Dr. *Burnet*, who saith, ' *In the* ' *Sponsions made by the Priests, they bind themselves to teach the* ' *People committed to their charge, to banish away all erroneous* ' *Doctrines, and to use both publick and private Monitions and Ex-* ' *hortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, within their Cures,* ' *as need shall require, and as occasion shall be given.* Such as re- ' member that they have plighted their Faith for this to God, ' will feel the *Pastoral Charge* to be a load indeed, and so be far ' enough from relinquishing it, or hiring it out to a loose or ' ignorant Mercenary. These are the *blemishes* and *Scandals* ' that *lye on our Church*, brought on it partly by the corruption ' of some Simoniacal Patrons, but chiefly by the *Negligence* of ' some, and the *Faultiness* of other Clergy-men: Which could ' never have lost so much ground in the Nation, upon such ' *trifling* accounts, as are the contests since raised about *Cere-* ' *monies*, if it were not that the *People*, by such palpable faults ' in the Persons and behaviour of some *Church-men*, have been ' possessed with prejudices, first against them, and then upon ' their account against the whole *Church*: So that these *corrupt* ' *Church-men* are not only to answer to God for all those *Souls* ' *within their charge*, that have perished through their neglect; ' but in a great degree for all the *mischief of the Schism among us*; ' *to the nourishing whereof they have given so great and palpable oc-* ' *casion.* The importance of those things, made me judge they ' deserved this Digression.

Having been thus large in removing the Mistakes the Dr's Substitute seem'd to lye under, let the *Sober Reader* judge, Whether 'tis any way probable that the *Jesuits* had an hand in the *first Separation*; or whether the *pretence* about *Spiritual Prayer* was any ground of their Separation? that is, Whether they were against a Form of Prayer, crying down the *English* Liturgy with a Design of setting up Free and Spiritual Prayer in its stead.

SECT.

SECT. II.

The Deſigns of the Jeſuit againſt a Prelatical Epiſcopacy, found to be none. Some Differences between the firſt Reformers and our Author. A Letter of Sir Francis Knolles *to the Lord Treaſurer* Cecil, *out of which 'tis prov'd, That there is a Difference between ſome old Queen* Elizabeths *Biſhops, and the Dean,* &c. *The Author's Pretences about Antiquity confuted out of Biſhop* Jewel.

HIS Reply to what I offer'd to the *Dean*'s ſecond Argument, falls now under Conſideration.

The *Dean* in repreſenting the Diſſenter, to the great Diſadvantage of the Party, inſinuates as if their oppoſing *Prelatical* Epiſcopacy, had been the moſt effectual way to caſt reproach on the firſt *Reformers*, and to introduce *Popery*.

In Anſwer unto this I did *Firſt* prove, 1. That it was not the Principle nor the Intereſt of the Jeſuit to deſtroy Epiſcopacy. A Truth the Dean's Subſtitute doth not deny. 2. That the Reputation of the firſt Reformation is not in the leaſt blaſted by the Diſſenter, which I evinc'd with ſo much Demonſtration, that the whole that is returned by way of *Anſwer*, is, His not believing ſome of thoſe perſons, on whoſe Teſtimony I inſiſted, (though he gives no Reaſon for his Unbelief.) His proving what I granted, and his Extravagant Interpreting an Argument brought to evince, *That 'twas not the Jeſuits Intereſt to deſtroy a Prelatical Epiſcopal Conſtitution, to be an admirable Addreſs to the Lords and Commons, to pull down Biſhops, and divide their Lands.* All which is done partly in his *Preface*, and partly in the firſt Chapter of his great Book, to ſhew himſelf an excellent *Methodiſt*. But the whole is ſo little to the purpoſe, that if he had not given an occaſion to enlighten the *Reader* concerning ſome momentous Inſtances, I would have paſs'd it by as deſerving no farther Conſideration.

1. Every thing is ſaid to be Miſrepreſented. But how the Doctor's own words ſhould miſrepreſent his own ſenſe, is not

overeasie to apprehend. However, Whether there be any Misreport, I'll leave it to the Impartial *Reader*, and consider what Reply is made to what I offer'd in Answer to the Doctor's *Uncomely Accusation.*

2. He grants, [*p.* 38.] That the *Papists* do not so much *Envy* and *Malign the Episcopal* Government. Neither is it their Principle nor Interest to destroy it. Why then should they be brought to act so contrary to their Principle and Interest, as to destroy what they so much endeavour to preserve, strengthen and establish? But

3. He adds, Though they are for *Episcopacy*, yet they may design the destruction of a *Protestant Episcopacy, &c.* Reply. I said, That 'twas not the *Destruction of Episcopacy*, but the *possessing themselves of our Bishopricks, that they would be at*, which may be without any alteration of the Episcopal Constitution, so far as 'tis Episcopal.

His running then unto *France* is nothing to the purpose, unless it may be looked on as an intimation of his good will to the *Arbitrary* proceedings of that Country.

However, I'le desire our Author to consider, That *a change of Persons without any alteration of the Episcopal Constitution*, may most effectually answer the end of *the Jesuit*. For hereby they would be capacitated (if ever a *Popish Prince* should come to the Crown) to argue with the common people concerning *the Unreasonableness of a separating from Rome*, from the same *Topicks* with the Dean, thus.

The Episcopacy is not pull'd down, nor destroyed, 'tis rather strengthened, and more firmly established. There is not so vast a difference between the Church of *England*, and the *Church* (I do not say the Court) of *Rome*, as there is between the *Romanist* and the *Factious Presbyterean*; behold, you have your *Bishops* still in all their *Glorious Vestments*; a *Surpliced Clergy*; an *Excellent English Liturgy* [for the *Papists* in *Dublin* have their Mass in *English*, which is exactly correspondent to the terms the *Papists* made the *English* in the days of Archbishop *Laud*] If you submit to the one, when Authority command you, why will you not to the other? What is the difference?

For this reason I cannot but be pretty confident that the *Jesuits* acting according to their *own Principles* and *Interest*, receive

ceive greateſt ſatisfaction from ſuch as are moſt deeply engag'd to repreſent the Epiſcopal Conſtitution as one moſt Excellent and Admirable.

Do not the whole Land know what 'tis that gives *life* unto *Jeſuitical hopes?* What are their deſigns and expectations from a *Popiſh Succeſſor?* and conſequently how miſchievous the Deſtruction of Epiſcopacy would prove unto that ſort of People, eſpecially at this *Juncture?* But I muſt not inſiſt on this, leſt I be cenſur'd as an *Addreſſer* to the *Lords* and *Commons* to pull down *Epiſcopacy*, a thing the *Jeſuit* would not be at, he being more *unwilling*, than by argument *unable* to oppoſe it, for which reaſon (as our learned Author ſays) Epiſcopacy is moſt eaſily defended againſt a *Roman Catholick*, (*i. e.*) againſt one that hath no heart to oppoſe it. But,

4. Our Author would by all means perſwade the world, that the Diſſenters caſt the greateſt *Reproaches* on the firſt Reformation, becauſe they manifeſt ſome diſſatisfaction with ſuch as impede a further Reformation; as if a good work was as ſoon conſummated as begun; or as if it had been either *impoſſible* in it ſelf, or *contrary* to the deſign of the *firſt Reformers*, to carry on the Reformation; or as if the preſent Conſtitution of *Epiſcopacy* had been in every momentous reſpect as excellent as that begun in King *Edwards* days; whereas 'tis well known unto wiſe men, and fully prov'd in my *Epiſtle* to the *Reverend Dean*, that 'twas impoſſible the Reformation ſhould be finiſhed as ſoon as 'twas entred on; and that the *firſt Reformers* in King *Edwards* days did more in ſix years than all their ſucceſſors have ſince done in almoſt ſix-ſcore. All which is prudently paſt over by our Author.

5. They ſtick much on that great *Agreement* there is between the *Preſent*, and King *Edwards Reformation*; as if we could not complain on the *latter*, without reproaching the *former*. But this is ſo *weakly* urg'd, that any *Reader* of an ordinary capacity may ſee the vanity of this way of arguing; for there is a great difference between *that* and *this* time; what was almoſt impoſſible then, might ſince be eaſily done. But, 2. 'tis eaſie to demonſtrate that the begun Reformation in King *Edward* the *6ths* days was more excellent than the Preſent; and that inſtead of carrying on the Reformation, it hath been

carried

carried back, to the great grief of ſound Proteſtants.

This hath been in part prov'd, when I did ſhew the Propenſion of Queen *Elizabeth* to favour *Popery*, out of Dr. *Burnet*, and Dr. *Heylin*, two Sons of the Church; though I fear the mentioning of the latter in Conjunction with the former, may not be ſo meet; the former being a through *Proteſtant*, a man of great Worth; but the heart of the latter towards *Rome*; for which reaſon, as their *Principles* are vaſtly different, ſo ſhould they be kept at a diſtance by me, if *Heylin* had not acknowledged that to be a *truth*, which I rather believe, becauſe found in the *incomparable Dr. Burnet.*

I'le now take notice of another conſiderable difference, between the very Conſtitution of *Epiſcopacy in King Edward* the *6th*'s time, and that in *Queen Elizabeths*: The *former* was ſuch as was inconſiſtent with the *Popes Supremacy*; for they were to hold all *their Courts in the Kings Name*; but the *latter*, ſuch as is moſt eaſily reduc'd to the *exalting the Court of Rome.* The Government of the Church being taken from the *Prince*, 'tis not ſo difficult to fix it on the *Pope.*

Thus there is a difference between King *Edwards*, and Queen *Elizabeths Epiſcopacies.* I may alſo add,

That there is a great difference between the *preſent* Conſtitution, and that in Queen *Elizabeths*, if we may believe the Lord *Treaſurer Cecil*, who ſuggeſts, that the *Biſhops* did not look on their *Superiority* above their Brethren, to be of *Divine Right*, as the *Dean of Pauls*, and his Subſtitute now do: For this I will give you an account we have of the Speeches uſed in the *Parliament* by Sir *Francis Knolles*, and after Written to my Lord *Treaſurer*, Sir *William Cecil*, as I find it in the end of the *Aſſertion.*

'To the end I may inform your Lordſhip of my dealing in 'this *Parliament-time*, againſt the undue claimed *Superiority of the* 'Biſhops over their *Inferior Brethren*: Thus it was,

'Becauſe I was in the Parliament-time, in the 25*th* year of 'King *Henry* the 8*th*, in which time, firſt all the Clergy, as 'well Biſhops as others, made an humble Submiſſion to King 'Henry the 8*th*, acknowledging his Supremacy, and deteſt-'ing the Uſurpation of the Biſhop of *Rome's* Authority: Up-'on which Submiſſion of the Clergy, the King gave unto the

'the ſaid Biſhops the ſame ample Rule, that before they had 'under the Pope, over their Inferior Brethren; ſaving that 'the ſame Rule was abridg'd by Statute, by this Parenthe-'ſis following, that is to ſay (without offending the Prero-'gative Royal of the Crown of *England*, and the Laws and 'Cuſtoms of the Realm): in the latter end of the Statute it 'was added, That whoſoever offendeth in any one part of 'that Statute, and their Aiders, Counſellers, and Abetters, 'they did all fall into the penalty of the Præmunire. And 'after I had recited this Statute in the Parliament-Houſe, I 'declared, that in King *Henry* the 8*th*'s days, after this, there 'was no Biſhop that did practiſe Superiority over the Infe-'rior Brethren. And in King *Edward*'s days the ſaid Biſhops 'obtained a Statute, whereby they were Authorized to keep 'their Courts in the Kings Name: the which Statute was 'repealed in Queen *Maries* days, and was not revived in 'her Majeſties time that now is; whereupon it was doubt-'ful to me, by what Authority the Biſhops do keep their 'Courts now in their own Names, becauſe it is againſt the 'Prerogative Royal of the Crown of *England*, that any ſhould 'keep a Court without ſufficient Warrant from the Crown: 'Whereupon I was anſwered, that the Biſhops do keep their 'Courts now by Preſcriptions; and it is true, that the Bi-'ſhops may Preſcribe, that King *Henry* the 8*th* gave them 'Authority by the Statute of the 25*th* of his Reign, to have 'Authority and Rule over their Inferior Brethren, as ample 'as they had in the Popes time: For this was no ſpecial 'Warrant for them to keep their Courts by, and that in 'their own Names. And yet they have none other War-'rant to keep their Courts (as they do now in their own 'Names) to my knowledg. And this was the Cauſe that 'made them obtain a Statute in King *Edward*'s days, to keep 'their Courts by, in the Kings Name. Now it is a ſtrange 'Allegation, that the Biſhops ſhould claim Authority at this 'preſent, to keep their Courts in their own Names (as they 'do) by Preſcription, becauſe the Statute of 25. doth re-'ſtrain them generally from offending of the Prerogative Roy-'al of the Crown of *England*, and the Laws and Cuſtoms of 'the Realm. And no man may juſtly keep a Court with-

out

'out a ſpecial Warrant from the Crown of *England*, as is a-
'foreſaid. And the general Liberty given by King *Henry* the
'8*th* to the Biſhops, to Rule and Govern as they did in the
'Popes time, is no ſufficient Warrant to the Biſhops, to keep
'their own Courts in their own Names by Preſcription, as I
'take it: And therefore the Biſhops had done wiſely, if they
'had ſought a Warrant by Statute, to keep their Courts in
'the Queens Name, as the Biſhops did in King *Edward*'s days:
'in which time Archbiſhop *Cranmer* did cauſe *Peter Martyr* and
'*Bucer* to come over into this Realm, to be placed in the Two
'Univerſities, for the better Inſtruction of the Univerſities in the
'Word of God. And Biſhop *Cranmer* did humbly prefer theſe
'Learned men without any challenge to himſelf of any Supe-
'rior Rule in this behalf, over his Inferior Brethren. And the
'time hath been, that no man could carry away any Grant from
'the Crown of *England* by general words, but that he muſt have
'ſpecial words to carry the ſame by: Therefore now the Biſhops
'are Warranted to carry away the keeping of their Courts in
'their own Names, by Preſcription, it paſſeth my underſtand-
'ing.

'Moreover, whereas your Lordſhip ſaid unto me, *that the Biſhops*
'*have forſaken their claim of Superiority over their inferior Brethren*
'(lately), *to be by Gods Ordinance*, and that *now they do only claim*
'*Superiority from her Majeſties Supreme Government.* If this be
'true, then 'tis requiſite, and neceſſary, that my Lord of *Can-*
'*terbury* that now is, do recant, and retract his ſaying in his
'Book of the great Volume againſt *Cartwright*, where he ſaith
'in plain words (by the name of Dr. *Whitgift*), that the Superi-
'ority of Biſhops is Gods own Inſtitution: which ſaying doth
'impugn her Majeſties Supreme Government directly; and
'therefore it is to be retracted plainly and truly. For Chriſt
'truly and plainly confeſſes, *John* 18. 36. That his Kingdom
'was not of this world; and therefore he gave no worldy Rule
'or Preheminence to his Apoſtles, but the Heavenly Rule,
'which was to Preach the Goſpel, ſaying, *Ite, prædicate in*
'*omnem mundum*; *Quicunque crediderit & baptizatus fuerit, ſal-*
'*vus erit: qui non crediderit, condemnabitur: Go and Preach in*
'*all the world, whoſoever ſhall believe and be baptized, ſhall be*
'*ſaved; but he that will not believe, ſhall be condemned*, Mar. 16. 16.

'But

'But the Biſhops do cry out, ſaying, That *Cartwright* and his 'Fellows would have no Government, *&c.* So belike the Bi-'ſhops care for no Government, but for worldly and forcible 'Government over their Brethren, the which Chriſt never gave 'to his Diſciples nor Apoſtles, but made them ſubject to the 'Rule of Princes, who ought not to be reſiſted, ſaving that they 'might anſwer unto Princes, that they muſt rather obey God 'than men, *Act.* 5. 29. And yet in no wiſe to reſiſt the Prince, 'but to take up the Croſs and follow Chriſt. So far Sir *Francis Knolles* Diſcourſe in *Parliament* concerning the *Epiſcopacy*, &c.

But to return: I would fain know, why we may not think *honourably of good beginnings*, even when we cannot approve of ſuch as put a ſtop thereunto? Is the *Epiſcopacy of King* Edward ſo much the ſame in all reſpects with the preſent, that whoever diſſents from this, muſt thereby caſt a reproach on that? Surely the *Dean* won't ſay ſo, after ſo many Months conſideration.

6. There is an *admirable diſtinction* inſiſted on, which will bring off the *Dean* without all doubt, *viz.* There is a *Popiſh* and a *Proteſtant* Epiſcopacy: But where lies the Difference? What Difference is there between our preſent Epiſcopacy, and that in *Henry* the 8ths time?

Is not the *Epiſcopacy*, ſo far as 'tis an Epiſcopacy, the ſame? What is there *Intrinſecal* to this Epiſcopal Conſtitution, that differs from *that?* Whence if that be *Popiſh*, why may not this, ſeeing 'tis the ſame with that, be in like manner *ſo?* That *Henry* the 8ths *Epiſcopacy* was *Popiſh*, Biſhop *Bramhall* hath evinced, in proving, that the *Papiſts* begun the Separation from *Rome*. In fine, Let our Author tell me the *Difference* between Queen *Maries Epiſcopacy* and Queen *Elizabeths Epiſcopacy* on her firſt entring the Throne. Is not the Epiſcopacy now the ſame with that at the Reforming the Liturgy by Act of Parliament? and was not that Epiſcopacy the ſame with Queen *Maries?* The *only ſpecifying Difference* that can be ſuggeſted is, that though the *Epiſcopacy as ſuch*, is the *ſame*, and the *Perſons* in both may be the *ſame*, yea and their *Principles*, for ſo it hath been in King *Henry* the 8th, King *Edward* the 6th, Queen *Mary*, and Queen *Elizabeth*; yet the *outward profeſſion* of the Biſhops is not the ſame. But is this *Extrinſecal Conſideration* ſufficient to occaſion

a Difference that is *Intrinſecal?* Moreover, to return to his *French Monarch*; Hath not the Experience of many a year aſſured us, That when *Monarchs* deſign not the enlarging their own *Monarchies*, they have done all they could to preſerve *other* Monarchies? An *Ariſtocracy*, or a *Democracy*, being things deteſtable in their eye.

7. His anſwering the Letter of the Council by tranſcribing part of Sir *Francis Walſingham*'s Letter, as recorded in Dr. *Burnet*, being little to the purpoſe, might have eſcaped my Conſideration, had it not been very neceſſary to ſuggeſt, *How prudently* he overlook'd the great Principles on which the Queen grounded her proceedings; the one being, *That Conſciences cannot be forced, but to be won and reduced by force of Truth, with the aid of time, and uſe of all good means of Inſtruction, and Perſwaſion.* A Principle unto which if our Clergy would adhere, it might have conduced very much to the Peace of the *Church*. This I ſuppoſe is a ſufficient Reply to the *Dean*'s Subſtitute.

The Diſſenters oppoſe Epiſcopacy and Ceremonies, notwithſtanding their Antiquity, &c. The Doctor's Argument was here ſet forth to the greateſt advantage of his Cauſe in his own words. To which I reply'd, *That our not embracing Epiſcopacy*, &c. *does not advantage the Papiſt, neither doth our rejecting it, even when it pretends to ſo much Antiquity.* I having ſhewn that there was no ſuch ſtrength in their Argument of Antiquity, if it fell ſhort of an *Abſolutely Primitive* or an *Apoſtolical Antiquity*, as theirs really doth; they not being able to ſhew in what part of the *Scriptures their Dioceſan Epiſcopacy is found*, it being conſider'd as a Creature of Human make, by many a Son of the *Church*, yea and once by our *great Doctor himſelf*; and it hath been prov'd by other hands unanſwerably, *That there is no evidence for ſuch an Epiſcopacy in the Church the firſt two hundred years*; for which reaſon Mr. *Chillingworth*'s *Argument*, ſhewing the vanity of ſuch mens pretences about *Antiquity*, that can aſcend no higher than the fifth, or fourth, or third, or ſecond Age, is, it may be, as *pertinently* urg'd, as the little intimation of Mr. *Ch's* ſenſe of the *Antiquity of Epiſcopacy*. 'Tis pleaſant then to ſee with what pertneſs our *Author* hopes, that our *Enquirer* will now grow ſo modeſt, as not to cite Mr. *Chil.* any more againſt an Argument from Antiquity.

The

The other part of his Reply is as little to the purpoſe, unleſs a declaiming againſt *Proteſtant* Arguments, ſuch as are too ſtrong to receive an Anſwer, be the moſt effectual way to ruine *Popery*. 'Tis true, we reject the *Popiſh* pretences about *Antiquity* as *futilous*; many *Proteſtants* (in the number of which ſome Nonconformiſts may be liſted) having unanſwerably proved *Popery to be a Novelty*.

However, If Popery or Epiſcopacy be not agreeable to the Scriptures, whatever their pretences are to *Antiquity*, they will be found unworthy the conſideration of a ſolid Divine; and therefore becauſe he ſends me to Biſhop *Jewel*, [Part 1. p. mihi, 539, *&c.*] I'll give the *Reader* an account of his ſenſe againſt *Harding*. *The Truth of God* (ſaith the Biſhop) *is neither further'd by the Face of* Antiquity, *nor hinder'd by the Opinion of* Novelty. *For oftentimes the thing that is* New *is condemned as* Old; *and the thing that is indeed* Old *is condemned as* New. *If* Newneſs *in Religion, in all reſpects, and every way, were ill, Chriſt would not have reſembled his Doctrine to* New Wine, *&c. Arnobius* ſaith, *The Authority of Religion muſt be weighed by God, and not by Time. It behoveth us to conſider not upon what day, but what things we begin to Worſhip.* ——The thing that is true, is never too late. Saint *Auguſtine* ſaies, *The Heathen ſay, The Religion that was* Firſt, *cannot be* Falſe; *as if Antiquity and old Cuſtom could prevail againſt the Truth.* The old Learned Father *Tertullian* ſaies, *Whatſoever thing ſavoureth againſt the Truth, the ſame is an* Hereſie, *yea although it be a* Cuſtom *never ſo* Old, *&c.*

This ſurely is the *Proteſtant* Doctrine; whence to talk of *Antiquity*, in order to the countenancing *that* in Religion, which finds no favour from the Scriptures, is but to advance the *Papal* Intereſt; who have but little beſide the pretence of Antiquity to ſupport their Abominations.

SECT. III.

A ſearch for the Schiſmatick. A true ſtate of the Difference between the Church of England *and the* Proteſtant *Diſſenter. The Diſſenter, according to our Author's Notion, clear'd from Schiſme. The*

Church of England *found Guilty. Some Remarks on several other passages in the* Dean's *Defence. An Account of some of the* Dean's *Mistakes. The Dissenter no friend to Popery. The Conclusion.*

1. THAT our *Divisions* advance the *Popish* Designs, is acknowledged. But the 2. Enquiry is, *Who is the Faulty Divider?* It being the Faulty Divider alone who gives the *Papist* the advantage. The great Enquiry then must be after the *Faulty Divider*, *Whether the Conformist*, *or the Nonconformist be the Divider?*

The state of the Case was given in the *Enquiry*, [p. 23.] where the Principle on which the Dissenters proceed was laid down, and improv'd; this should have been consider'd by our *Author*, but he was so prudent as to pass it by: For which Reason, without any Reflections on my Learned Adversary, I must mind him of the *state of the Controversie*, and shew wherein he hath exercised his Wisdom in leaping over what he could not handsomly remove out of the way.

In the *Enquiry after the Faulty Divider*, I shewed wherein the Parties at variance agreed, and wherein they differ'd. 1. They agreed in those Points commonly called *Doctrinal* or *Substantial*, in contradistinction to *lesser things*, about *Worship* and *Church-Discipline*, &c. They differ'd about what was in the Judgment of the Dissenter *Sinful*; but in the Opinion of the Episcopal, only *Indifferent*.

'Tis true, the *Episcopal* represent us as a weak People, whose Consciences as to those particulars are *Erroneous*; that therefore we must cast off these erring Consciences, and submit.

Our *Reply* is, We seek Heaven for Counsel, we study hard for the Truth, read with the greatest Impartiality and Freedom the Discourses the *Episcopal* have written; For we can solemnly and with much sincerity declare, as in the presence of an Heart-searching God, We would with the greatest chearfulness Conform to all the *Impositions*, if we thought we could do it without sin. That we are so *peevish* as to lose the Comforts of a good Benefice, merely to gratifie an obstinate Humour; if we are in danger of being biass'd one way more than another by carnal

carnal conſiderations, 'tis *towards Conformity.* For if we conform, we are freed from the reproaches and contempt of many, from the continued fear of Impriſonment, and other uncomfortable ſeverities, and in a fair way of abounding with the good things of this life for the ſupporting our ſelves and Families. But if we conform not, we are repreſented as *Factious* and *Seditious*, expos'd to the Rage of every vile *Informer*, in conſtant danger of Fines, &c. and of more miſeries than I can with delight reherſe.

However, though there are conſiderations enough from the world to byas our minds, in a ſeeking for the Truth, to lean towards *Conformity*; yet deſiring to approve our ſelves ſincere towards God, we find, *That we cannot without ſin conform*; we cannot without ſinning deliberately, and knowingly comply with the *Epiſcopal Impoſitions*; and if we ſhould notwithſtanding conform to live and die Conformiſts, we ſhould knowingly, and deliberately ſin, yea, and die under the *guilt* thereof, which is a thing ſo hazardous to the ſoul, that we durſt not touch with Conformity, leſt we die, leſt we die eternally.

We cenſure not ſuch as do *conform*, becauſe they not lying under the *ſame convictions* of Conſcience as we do, may not by their Conformity run that hazard, which we unavoidably muſt, ſhould we againſt the *light of our Conſciences* comply. There is a great difference between thoſe that act according to the directions of their Conſciences, and ſuch as act contrary thereunto: For which reaſon I wonder, that our great *Church-men* ſhould ſay, that Mr. *Baxter* repreſented all *Conformiſts* as a company of *Perjured Villains*, meerly becauſe he ſhew'd, that if the Nonconformiſts ſhould contrary to the Dictates of their Conſcience conform, they ſhould be guilty of *Perjury*, and ſeveral other great ſins.

But though this be the truth, yet there are ſome who will not believe it, who ſay we, do we what we can for their ſatisfaction, will count us a *pack of Hypocrites.* For which reaſon, that I might anticipate the cenſure, I laid down the *Principle* unto which Diſſenters do moſt firmly adhere, the diſcuſſing which is what they do moſt ſincerely deſire.

The Principle is this, *That the word of God contained in Scripture, is the* only *Rule of the Whole, and of every part of true Religion.*

gion. As for *external circumſtances*, as time and place, *&c.* being no part of, though neceſſary appendages unto our Religion.

From this *Principle* I proceed to this Concluſion, *That whatever part of the Service of the Church of* England *is impos'd on us, as ſo neceſſary a part of our Religion, as to be a term of Communion, if not agreeable to the word of God in Scripture, that Impoſition is ſinful.*

Our Adverſary conſiders, that ſuch as live in *England*, and yet are not of the Church of *England*, do not belong unto the Catholick Church; that is, they are all in a ſtate of damnation. Hence 'tis we muſt, according unto him, be a member of the Church of *England*, or be damned. We are willing with all our hearts to be members of the ſame Church with them, *i.e.* to be members of the Catholick Church is what we deſire. But this, ſay they, we cannot be, but by complying with their impoſed *terms*. To which we reply, Let their terms be as Catholick as they pretend their Church is, and we'l comply: *i.e.* Let them keep to a *few, certain*, and *neceſſary* things; let them not impoſe as terms of Union, any thing but what is according to the *Word* of God in Scripture, we are ſatisfied, the Controverſie is at an end. But if they will take on 'em to make that a *part of true Religion*, yea ſo *neceſſary a part*, as to *make it a term of our communion with the Catholick Church*, 'tis a ſinful encroachment on the Prerogative of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, with which we dare not comply.

If they expect our compliance, why do they not ſhew the Scriptures that declare the things they impoſe, to be ſo neceſſary a part of true Religion, as to be a form of our communion with the Catholick Church? They muſt not only ſhew that thoſe things are agreeable to true Religion, but moreover that they are ſo neceſſary a part thereof, that whoever conforms not to them when impos'd, is *ipſo facto* cut off from the Catholick Church. This they can never do, and therefore can never clear themſelves from being the *faulty dividers*.

When we provoke 'em to ſhew us what Scriptures direct them to their Impoſitions, we are turn'd off with *Where is it forbidden?* as if they had acted exactly to the Rule * *Coſterus* the Jeſuit gave his young Scholars, *If any object, Where are thoſe points*, viz. *The Invocation of Saints, The worſhipping of Images, The abſtaining from fleſh,*

* *Si objiciant in ſacris literis non haberi Invocandos eſſe Sanctos, venerandas Imagines, abſtinendum à Carnibus, aut aliquid ejuſmodi; non ergo iſta eſſe facienda: nos contra objiciamus & quidem Efficacius: Hæc Sacris Literis non Prohiberi, atque ſine peccato fieri poſſe, quia tibi non eſt Lex ibi nec prævaricatio.* Coſ. *Inſtit. Chriſt.* l. 2. c. 1.

ſleſh, and the like, found in Scripture; and becauſe not found in Scripture, therefore to be rejected. To which, ſaith the Jeſuit, *anſwer thus: Ask where 'tis forbidden in Scripture? if not forbidden in Scripture, 'tis no ſin to obſerve 'em; for where there is no Law, there is no tranſgreſſion.* So far *Coſterus.*

To whom we rejoyn, *That the holy Scriptures being the* only *Rule of the Whole, and of Every part of true Religion*, if theſe things be not according to the Scripture, 'tis becauſe there is no truth in 'em. There muſt be an exact correſpondency and agreeableneſs between the Rule and its Regulate. The Regulate muſt be brought to the Rule, and if it doth not agree with it, 'tis becauſe the Regulate is not Right. The word of God in Scripture is the Rule, what Religion ſoever varies from the Rule, 'tis a falſe Religion. *Rectum eſt Index ſui & obliqui.*

There are ſome Religions are larger than the Rule. There are other Religions that fall ſhort of the Rule. They who embrace any Notion as a part of their Religion, which is not to be found in Scripture, is too large for the Scripture; and ſuch as reject what the Scripture injoins, have a Religion too ſhort. The one puts the Scripture on the Rack, to ſtretch it to their Religion; but the other pares off a conſiderable part of Scripture, that the Rule may not exceed their Religion. But ſuch as keep exactly to the word of God in Scripture, who neither go beyond, nor fall ſhort of it, are in the right.

To make that a part of our Religion which is not to be found in Scripture, is to take that for a part of our Religion which God hath not made a part thereof, which is ſinful. How much more ſo is the making it a term of communion?

That the things in controverſie between the Church and the Diſſenter, are not to be found in Scripture, and conſequently are no part of true Religion, is evident, not only becauſe we can't underſtand where 'tis to be found, nor becauſe the Churchmen cannot direct us where to find it; but becauſe they themſelves look on 'em as indifferent, *i. e.* as what is not injoin'd us in the word of God, *q. d.* as what is not according to the word of God.

All this being moſt plain and obvious to an ordinary Capacity that is not biaſſed by Prejudice, *&c.* Let the world judge who is in the *FAULT*, They who keep cloſe to Scripture, or they

they who recede therefrom. They who will do any thing, but Sin, for Peace; Or they who will exercise their Authority, and impose unnecessary things with the greatest Violence imaginable: I say, with the greatest Violence imaginable; for they are impos'd with such a severe Threatning annex'd, that whoever refuses a compliance, is cut off from the Catholick *Church*, and given over to the Devil. Hence 'tis, that they imposing Indifferent things as necessary to Salvation, do according to Dr. *Stillingfleet's* own Rule, declare themselves to be the *Schismatical Dividers.*

I say, according to Dr. *Stillingfleet's* own *Rule*, compar'd with his *Substitutes Notion.* In the Doctor's *Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 213. he saith, That *there are three* Cases *wherein the Scripture allow of Separation.* The *last* of which is, *When men make things Indifferent* Necessary *to Salvation, and divide the Church upon that account; and this was the Case of the false Apostles, who urged the Ceremonies of the Law, as necessary to Salvation.——Now although St.* Paul *himself complied sometimes with the practice of them.—— Yet when these false Apostles came to enforce the Observation of them as necessary to Salvation,* then he bids the Christians at *Philippi* to beware of them; i.e. *To fly their Communion, and have nothing to do with them.*

From this Rule of Dr. *Stillingfleet* it must follow, That if the *Church* of *England* make things *Indifferent Necessary to Salvation*, our Separation from the *Church* is allowed by the Scriptures; yea commanded and enjoyned. We must beware of 'em, *(i. e.)* to fly their Communnion, and have nothing to do with them. But that things Indifferent are made necessary by the *Church* of *England*, according to his Doctrine, doth appear irrefragably.

That which is Necessary to our Communion with the Catholick *Church, is, according to his Doctrine, necessary to Salvation. But* Indifferent things *are Necessary to our* Communion *with the Church of* England, *which is One with the Communion with the Catholick Church, in that, according to him, they are made necessary to our* Communion *with the Church of* England, *which is One with the Communion with the Catholique Church*, according to his constant Judgment. *Ergo.*

Or in other Terms, Whatever is made necessary to our being

ing Members of the *Catholique Church*, is made neceſſary to Salvation; for to be Members of the *Catholick Church*, and to be in a ſtate of Salvation, is the ſame; and to be Members of the particular *Church* of *England*, and Members of the *Catholick Church* is one and the ſame with our Author, [*p.* 248.] As if it had been ſaid, To be Members of the *Church* of *England*, is to be in a ſtate of Salvation; but not to be Members of the *Church* of *England*, is to be out of a ſtate of Salvation. Whence what is made neceſſary to our being Members of the *Church* of *England*, is made neceſſary to our Salvation; that is, *The many indifferent Ceremonies impos'd, as terms of our Communion with the Church of* England, *are made neceſſary for Salvation*, according to our Author.

For which reaſon *the Scripture* allows our Separation, yea the Scripture bids us beware of her, that is, to fly her Communion, and have nothing to do with her. Thus the *Doctor* in conjunction with his *Subſtitute* furniſhes us with an unanſwerable Argument to clear the Diſſenter from the odious Sin of *Schiſm*, which in ſhort is this;

From ſuch as make Indifferent things Neceſſary to Salvation, we muſt Separate. This is Dr. *Stillingfleet's.*

But the Church of England *makes Indifferent things neceſſary to Salvation.* This is the Dr's Subſtitutes Notion.

Ergo, We may, yea we muſt Separate; that is, 'Tis the Will of God we ſhould Separate, or 'tis our Duty, and therefore not our Sin to ſeparate; *(i. e.)* We are not the *Schiſmaticks.*

This is *Argumentum ad Hominem*; and either this Author muſt quit his Doctrine, or acquit us of *Schiſme.*

But to treat our Author with the greater Civility, we'll ſuppoſe him to be ſo tenacious of his own Doctrine, that he'll rather diſcharge us of *Schiſme* than abandon his beloved Notions; for which reaſon, ſeeing 'tis on all ſides acknowledged that there is a Faulty Diviſion among us, and conſequently a *Faulty Divider*, who is the *Schiſmatick*; He muſt be either the Diſſenter, or the Conformiſt; but not the *Diſſenter*, as we have already prov'd from our Author's own *Topicks*; *Ergo*, the Conformiſt. Here we might have put an end to this Diſcourſe, and would do ſo, had not our Author's fertil Brain furniſh'd us with another Argument, that doth as fully evince the *Conformiſt*

to be the *Schiſmatick*, as the former clear'd the *Diſſenter*.

In the management of this Argument, we'll conſider the *Notion of* Dr. *Peter Gunning* and *Peirſon*, as compared with our Author.

The Learned *G.* and *P.* in *a Conference with the Papiſts*, aſſert, *That a Superiours unjuſt caſting any out of the Church, is Schiſmatical.* If the Governours of the *Church* do by ſinful Impoſitions, or unjuſt Excommunications caſt any out of the *Church*, they are *Schiſmatical.* This our *Author* won't deny.

But according to his Notion, The *Church of* England are guilty of *ſuch Impoſitions*, and do *unjuſtly Excommunicate Diſſenters.*

1. That the *Impoſitions* are *ſinful* is evident, in that Indifferent things (as has been prov'd) are made neceſſary to Salvation. The making any Indifferent thing Neceſſary to Salvation, is ſinful. But the impoſing indifferent things as terms of *Catholique* Communion, is the making ſuch things Neceſſary to Salvation. *Ergo*, Sinful. *Ergo*, The Impoſer is Schiſmatical. But

2. Whoever doth unjuſtly Excommunicate any, are Schiſmatical. This is Dr. *Gunning*'s ſenſe. But the *Church of* England (if they agree with our Author) Excommunicates the Diſſenter *unjuſtly*. *Ergo*, &c.

That the *Church* of *England* Excommunicates unjuſtly, according to the Doctrine of our Author, is demonſtrable; even in that the *Church* doth, as he would have it, by Excommunication caſt thouſands out of a ſtate of Salvation, for not complying with little uncommanded things. Whence I argue thus, To Excommunicate, or caſt us out of a ſtate of Salvation, merely becauſe we cannot comply with what God never commanded us, is to Excommunicate unjuſtly: But ſo doth the *Church* of *England*, if we may paſs a cenſure on her as our Author provokes us to do; for the *Church* according unto him doth Excommunicate, that is, ſhut Heaven-gates againſt ſuch to whom our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath promiſed the opening them.

To illuſtrate this with the greater clearneſs, I beſeech the *Reader* to conſider, That Salvation is promiſed by *Jeſus Chriſt* unto all ſuch as do ſincerely Believe, truly Repent, and lead an Holy Life in all Godlineſs and Honeſty. Though a man may be daily guilty of leſſer Evils, yet if he believe in *Chriſt*, and

and rendets ſincere Obedience to the known Will of God, he ſhall be ſaved. All which may be, even with thoſe, who being verily perſwaded that their compliances with the preſent Impoſitions are ſinful, durſt not Conform; that is, *The Promiſe of Salvation is made by Chriſt to many, who do not conform to the Impoſitions of the Church of* England. But Salvation by our *Author* is denied unto ſuch, their Non-compliance is enough to make 'em *Schiſmatical*, to cut them off from Chriſt, and the hopes of Salvation, which being no ways juſtifiable in the Conſcience of any ſober man, the *Diſſenters* are unjuſtly Excommunicated; and he that ſo Excommunicates, is *Schiſmatical*.

'Tis moſt certain, That many good Chriſtians cannot conform to the impoſed terms of Communion with the *Church*, and that for this ſingle Reaſon they are Excommunicable, if not actually Excommunicated from the *Church*; that is, put out of a ſtate of Salvation. The which being ſo, 'twill unavoidably follow, *That either the Excommunication is unjuſt*; or, *That the Church hath greater Power, than he that is the Lord of it, to open and ſhut the gates of Heaven.* If the *latter*, then the *Church* ſets it ſelf up above all that is called God in this world, and Chriſt in the other. For whereas Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, is ſufficient for our Salvation; theſe add ſomwhat more, to wit, an Obedience to new Impoſitions, threatning the neglect with Damnation. But if the *former*, if the Excommunication is *unjuſt*, then according to Dr. *Gunning*, with the addition of our Author, *Our Eccleſiaſtical Governours are the Schiſmaticks.* The Argument here in ſhort is this;

He that doth unjuſtly Excommunicate any out of the Catholick Church, is a Schiſmatick. This is Dr. *Gunning's.*

But the Church of England, *ſhutting thoſe out of Salvation to whom Chriſt hath promiſed it, Excommunicates unjuſtly.* This is our Authors.

Therefore the Church of England, according to the Poſition of our Author, *is the Schiſmatick.*

Hereby we may eaſily perceive, what an admirable Defender the *Church* of *England* hath, in the Defender of the *Dean*; and how little the *true Proteſtant* Clergy of the *Church* are beholding to this man, who inſiſts on ſuch Notions as do neceſſarily lead judicious men to conclude the *Church of* England *Schiſmatical.*

But to return to our Author, who leaping over all the difficulties, though but hinted in the *Enquiry*, runs unto another Queſtion, viz. *From Ceremonies* to *Circumſtances*; from the *Parts of their Religion*, to the *external Appendages* thereunto, confounding the one with the other, and then runs triumphantly, aſſuring his *Reader*, That 'tis impoſſible to worſhip God, or exerciſe any act of Religion, but it muſt be in *ſome time*, or in ſome place; it muſt be done in *ſome circumſtances*, therefore we may make ſome things a part of our Religion, which God has not. At this rate he fills up a great part of his *Second Chapter*. Inſiſting on nothing but what had its anſwer in that *Enquiry* he attempted to confute. Therefore if I ſhould ſay no more than what I have in giving the true ſtate of the Controverſie, it would be ſufficient: For it lies on him either to prove to our *Conviction*, that *We may without ſin comply with their Impoſitions*, (i.e.) He muſt ſo far effectually enlighten our Conſcience, as to help us to ſee, that the *Impoſitions* are not ſinful, and that we may lawfully Conform; or ſhew, *That we muſt Conform contrary to the Convictions of our Conſciences, and render a blind Obedience unto their Commands*, Believing as the *Church* believes; or they ought to remove the Impoſitions, or acknowledge that our Compliances are not ſinful. One of theſe muſt be done. Let him do either, and the Controverſie will be ended, and the Diſſenters freed from *Schiſme*. But if he cannot enlighten us to ſee the Lawfulneſs of their Impoſitions, nor perſwade us to render a blind Obedience, nor remove the Impoſitions, but plead for their continuance, 'twill appear, That *they* by impoſing what in their *Judgments* is but *Indifferent*, *as things neceſſary to our Salvation*, are the *Schiſmaticks*. This might ſuffice as a full Anſwer.

But that nothing may eſcape conſideration, that our *Author* may think deſerves it, I'le reflect a little on his main ſtrength. *If there be any force in this Argument* (ſays he) *it conſiſts in theſe two things: Firſt, That all things which are in their own nature indifferent, may without ſin be parted with. And ſecondly, That the Opinion of Diſſenters, That indifferent things are unlawful in the worſhip of God, is a juſt reaſon for parting with them: For if it be not lawful to part with every thing that is* indifferent, *thoſe who retain the uſe of ſome indifferent things, cannot meerly upon that account be called Dividers or Schiſmaticks; and if the opinion of Diſſenters that all*

all indifferent things are unlawful, be not a ſufficient reaſon for parting with them, then there may be no fault in the Epiſcopals will not, *nor a ſufficient juſtification or excuſe in the Diſſenters* cannot. p. 9.

Firſt, ſaith he, *If there be any force in this Argument, it conſiſts in two things:* Firſt, *That all things which are in their own nature indifferent, may without ſin be parted with.* This is his miſtake; he ſhould have ſaid, That if there be any ſtrength in the *Enquiry*, it lyes in this, viz. *No one indifferent Ceremony muſt be made ſo neceſſary a part of Religion, as to be a term of Communion.* 'Tis this he ſhould have conſidered. For you ſin by inſiſting on any one, or more indifferent things ſo zealouſly as to make 'em terms of Communion with your *Church*, and conſequetly with the *Church Catholick*; ſo as to deny us a right to *Chriſt* and Salvation, for a mere non-compliance. You can part with your indifferent Ceremonies without ſin, and open the door of Salvation to the wretched Diſſenter if you will, even when they *cannot* without ſin comply with your intolerable Impoſitions. The indifferent things you impoſe, you impoſe as terms of our Communion with you, which you make to be the ſame with *Catholick* Communion, that is of Salvation.

2. You add the ſecond thing, viz. *That the Opinion of Diſſenters, That Indifferent things are unlawful, is a juſt reaſon for parting with them. For if it be not,* ſay you, *lawful to part with every thing that is indifferent; thoſe who retain the uſe of Indifferent things, cannot merely upon that account be called Dividers, or* Schiſmaticks, *&c.*

You ſhould remember, that I diſtinguiſhed between *Ceremonies* and *Circumſtances*, between what is a part of Religion, and Intrinſecal thereunto, and what is Extrinſecal only: But you run to external Circumſtances that are neceſſary in *Theſi*, which is off from the point in hand.

You run from what is *Indifferent* to what is *Neceſſary*, as if we called you to part with any neceſſary thing; whereas there is never any indifferent Ceremony that is grievous to our Conſciences, but you may part with, or ceaſe to impoſe 'em, and yet worſhip God. But to divide neceſſary circumſtances of Action from the Action, is impoſſible. A thing we no way deſire.

'Tis true as you aſſert, *A man who is to remove from* London

to

to York, *is not bound either to go thither on foot, or on horſeback, or in a Coach, or in a Waggon, each of theſe ways are in themſelves indifferent; but yet if he will travel to* York, *he muſt uſe one or other of theſe ways of Motion; not one in particular is neceſſary, yet one or other is.* But what is this to our purpoſe? What though the Partition-wall between *Ceremonies* and *Circumſtances* be *broken down*, and they all mingled together, and all muſt be conſider'd alike but as Circumſtances, What will this help you? To keep to your pretty Alluſion with one *neceſſary Addition, viz.* One hath not ſtrength to walk on foot from *London* to *York*, another cannot bear the *riding in Coach*, yet to *York* they muſt go. If you'll keep to the point before us, you muſt ſay to the perſon that *cann't* walk to *York*, Some way of Motion is neceſſary to your going to *York*, if you'l go thither; therefore you ſhall *walk*, or not go thither: And to the other that can't ride in a Coach, if you'll not go thither in a Coach, you ſhall not go at all; and yet give him the *Strapado* for not going thither.

This is the Caſe; and how eaſily may they reply unto you on your calling them to haſten to *York* on theſe *impoſſible terms*, or to the *Biſhops Colehouſe*? We would go to *York* with all our heart on Horſeback, or in a Waggon; but to walk or to ride in a Coach we cannot. You *can* give us leave to go thither on horſback, if you will, but you *will* not; we would go, but go in Coach, or *walk*, we *cannot*. Here is a diviſion, your *will not*, and our *cannot*; who now is in fault? That they *cannot*, is evident becauſe of *weakneſs* and Infirmity of body; That you *can* permit 'em to go on Horſeback, is as unqueſtionable; but yet you *will not*.

Thus we have the ſtrength of our Author's Reply; You muſt get into the *viſible Catholick Church*, or to priſon; and you cannot get in, but you muſt either uſe ſome *external circumſtances* in ſome time, or in ſome place, *&c.* therefore *this time*, or *no time*; *this place* or *no place*. Sir, by your good favour, as you acknowledg this or the other particular circumſtance to be *indifferent*, and that *other* circumſtances may be choſen, if not *this*; to make either of theſe *indifferent circumſtances* a *neceſſary term of communion*, is *ſinful* and *ſchiſmatical*. To make of a *little* thing ſo *great* a bar to ſhut thouſands out of heaven, is what you will never be able to anſwer when you ſhall appear before the Tribunal of a righteous God. But

But as to the true ſtate of the Controverſie, 'tis another thing; you make *that a part of Religion* which *God hath not made*; you impoſe *uninſtituted* ceremonies, and in many things recede from the *Apoſtolical Inſtitution*, and call on us on pain of damnation to comply with you. We muſt comply, or be cut off from the Catholick Church, even from the body of Chriſt, from all hopes of ſalvation.

Theſe things being thus plain, I'le gratifie our Authors deſire in conſidering his Logick. *If the Diſſenters can without ſin* (ſays he) *obey their Governours in* indifferent, *that is*, in lawful things, *but will not*; *and the Epiſcopal would be content to part with indifferent things for union, but* cannot, *who is the Divider? What muſt be done for Union? Muſt the Diſſenters comply in things wherein they can without ſin*; *or muſt the Epiſcopal ſin and loſe their peace with God for Union?* p. 29.

This is called by our *Author* an Argument, but why, I cannot imagine; however let it be ſo, wherein lies its ſtrength, or how comes it to paſs, that this cannot be anſwered, without a ſhewing *Sophiſtry* to be where 'tis not?

If there be any force in this Argument, it muſt be either in this, viz. *That the Impoſitions are in the judgment of the Diſſenters Lawful*, or *Indifferent*, which may be ſubmitted unto without ſin. Had this ſuggeſtion been true, we would grant him the whole he deſires, *viz.* That the Diſſenters refuſing to do what is Lawful in their own judgment to be done for Union, they are *Faulty*. But 'tis notorious, That the impoſed terms are of ſuch a nature, that they cannot be ſubmitted unto by the Diſſenter, but he muſt grievouſly offend the moſt high God, to the wounding his own conſcience.

If its ſtrength lyes not there, it muſt in this, That the *Epiſcopal* would be content to *part with* indifferent things, but *cannot*. And why can they not? What is the matter that they *cannot* part with *toys* and *trifles* to take many a thouſand within the pale of the Church, and thereby help 'em to Heaven? The things are ſtill ſuppoſed indifferent by our Author, and therefore a parting with 'em is not contrary to any Law, nor *ſinful*. Why then can they not without ſin part with, what they can part with without ſin? This is ſurely myſterious! They cannot part with that without ſin, which they can part with without ſin, and

yet

Yet will not part with it, though according to their own judgment their not parting with their indifferent things tends to the unavoidable deſtruction of ſouls. They know the Diſſenters, unleſs theſe indifferent things be paſt by, muſt be kept out of the Church of *England*, that is, out of the *Catholick Church* ſay they, and remain to the laſt hour of their life in a ſtate of damnation. Whence then did I ſay, *What muſt muſt be done for Union?* I may now ſay, *What muſt be done to ſave the thouſands of Souls for whom Chriſt died?* Muſt the *Epiſcopal* part with what they *can* without ſin, and take the Diſſenters into the *Catholique Church*, and thereby ſave their Souls; or muſt the *Diſſenters* ſin that they may be ſaved? What, Is there no way to Heaven for *Engliſh* Diſſenters, but their complying with *ſinful* Impoſitions? 'Twas ſaid in the Apoſtles days, that *We muſt not do evil, that good may come thereof.* Then ſurely, if we will be of the Apoſtles judgment, *We muſt not ſin, to ſave our Souls. Our Unrighteouſneſs doth not*, cannot *commend the Righteouſneſs of God.* But

Before I diſmiſs this Point, that the Reader may be fully ſatisfied that I abuſe not our Author, I muſt beſeech him to conſider;

1. That our *Author* hath, in a way different from the greateſt, or rather the better part of the Clergy, aſſerted, That our not holding external communion with the Church of *England*, is a cutting our ſelves off from the *Catholick Church*, a putting our ſelves out of the Way of Salvation. This is the main ſcope of his diſcourſe. A notion concerning which Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s thoughts are deſired.

2. That notwithſtanding the abſolute neceſſity there is of the Diſſenters returning to the Church of *England*, that they may become members of the Univerſal Church, and be ſav'd, they will not part with any of thoſe things that are in their own judgment little, though it be to ſave the Diſſenters ſouls. If they would remove what is in their own judgment but *little*, and what may be done without their ſin, but what cannot be complied with by the Diſſenter without his great ſin, the Controverſie is ended, the *Schiſm* loſt, and the Diſſenter reſtor'd to the *Catholick Church*, and may be ſav'd. Let the World judg then who is in the *fault*.

There remaineth nothing more that is worthy our conſideration, unleſs the many *ſlips* of our Author may be eſteem'd as ſuch,

ſuch, by the Authors inſiſting on my parallelling Dr. *Stillingfleet* and *Bellarmine*, not only in their *Dividing Principles*, but alſo in that, even when by their Impoſitions; they make the greateſt rents in the *Church* imaginable, they *ſpeak well of Union*, but this is only an overt-act of his inadvertency. For the reaſon why I mentioned this, was to obviate a common Objection, viz. *How can you parallel the Doctor and* Bellarmine *in this, ſeeing the Doctor cries up Union ſo much, as the deſigne of his great Book, as well as of his Sermon?* To which I reply, That though the *Principles* of *Bellarmine* were Dividing, yet he cries up Union; for which reaſon though the Doctor applauds *Union*, yet in doing ſo, doth no more than *Bellarmine*, and therefore may be as much a Divider as *Bellarmine*, notwithſtanding thoſe many plauſible Diſcourſes concerning the excellency of Union; for Union is a lovely name in the judgment of ſuch as will do nothing to obtain *the thing*.

His paſſing over the moſt momentous parts of the *Enquiry*, without ſaying any thing conſiderable unto 'em, makes a further Defence, at preſent, unneceſſary; I ſay for the preſent, becauſe he ſeems to threaten, as if I ſhould hear more of it in *DUE TIME*.

To cloſe then this diſcourſe, it only remains, that in Charity to our Author, whoſe *Affections to Dr.* Stillingfleet have ſo abundantly blinded his Judgment, that he cannot, though in ſearching till he hath wearied himſelf, find out any Miſtake in the Dr's Preface, I'll give him an *Account* of a few among many, and then ſhew what little Reaſon ſuch of the *Church* of *England*, who are for the *Grotian*, or Biſhop *Laud*'s Model, have to reproach Diſſenters, as a People carrying on *Popiſh Deſigns*, in blaſting the honour of the firſt Reformation.

§ 1. *An Account of ſome of thoſe* Miſtakes, *which are found in Dr.* Stillingfleet's *Preface to his* Unreaſonableneſs of Separation, *not to mention any thing of the Parallel between the Dean and the Jeſuit, ſo much inſiſted on in the* Enquiry.

1. THE Dean asserted, *p.* 14. a *suitableness* between the *Dissenters Pretences*, and the *Jesuits Doctrines*, about Spiritual Prayer: whereas I have evinced the contrary.

2. That the Grounds and Reasons of the first Separation of the old Nonconformist from the *Church* of *England*, are said to be the *Jesuits* crying down *all Forms of Prayer*, and setting up *Spiritual Prayer* in the room thereof. But I have proved, that the first who separated, did keep to a Form of Prayer.

3. That the Dissenters do blast the honour of the first Reformation; but they so far countenance it, as to endeavour the carrying it on.

4. That the Dissenters are the best *Proctors* the *Papists* could meet with, their *fittest and aptest Instruments*; that they were made the Engins of the *Roman* Conclave, *p.* 16. All which the Doctor takes out of Archbishop *Whitgift*. But an unjust Censure, if not a great Mistake.

5. That the *Episcopacy* now and in King *Edward*'s days was the same; whereas in King *Edward*'s days they held all their Courts in the King's name, but now in their own.

6. That there is no considerable difference between the Reformation begun in *Edward* the 6ths, and that carried on in Queen *Elizabeths* time: Whereas 'tis most apparent, that in King *Edward*'s time they judged the *Pope* to be *Antichrist*; but in Queen *Elizabeths* not a word of it; and many other differences.

All which relate unto *matter of fact*, and therefore may be rightly called *Historical Mistakes*. Many more might be insisted on, but these are sufficient to help our Author to see, that if his eyes had been good, he needed not to weary himself in making a search after them without effect. If this will not satisfie our Author, if he will call for a larger list of the *Dean's* Mistakes, I do

do assure him 'tis easie enough to add a multitude more, although I delight not in a detecting the Weaknesses of any.

§ 2. Thus having given an hint of some of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Mistakes found in his Preface; I shall conclude, by shewing what little Reason, such as our Author, have to make such a prodigious noise about the Dissenters subserviency to *Popish Designs*, in blasting the honour of the Reformation.

Sir, If the case be narrowly searched into, you will find, that in all times since the first Reformation, those call'd *Puritans* were a block in the way to the *Church* of *Englands* passing over towards *Rome*. Had it not been for the Industry of the *Nonconformist*, as all the forreign Protestant *Churches* beyond the Seas are *Unchurched* by our high-flown Episcopal men, even so they should have been abandon'd as *Heretical*, but that the *Dissenter* makes such a clamour on all occasions about *Popery*.

You have very ingeniously distinguish'd between the *Church*, and the *Court* of *Rome*, and have taken the most effectual care to endeavour that favour might be shewn the *Church* of *Rome*, even when you cry down *Popery*; as if the common People had understood by *Popery* no more than your self, namely the *Court* of *Rome*; whereas they think, that when you cry down *Popery*, you are enemies to the *Church* of *Rome*. A pretty juggle! Popery is an odious thing, even when to be a *Roman Catholick* is worthy of all applause. *Laud* was no *Papist*, he was an enemy to *Popery*, when a cordial Friend to the *Church* of *Rome*. *Popery* is detestable, when all the care imaginable must be taken, that nothing be done to the disgust of the *Roman Church*. Consult *Bramhall* and *Heylin*, to mention no more, to see whether these be not their Sentiments.

You boast strangely of King *Edwards* Reformaton, not considering how short of it, in some things, you are fall'n. You represent us as blasters of the Reformation begun in his days, not duely minding what one of your own Faction, Dr. *Heylin*, hath said on't in his *Preface to the History of the Reformation*:

Take the Character he gives of *Edward* the 6th, and make the moſt of it; 'tis this, *Scarce had they* (ſaith he) *brought it*, [*viz.* the Reformation] *to paſs, when* Edward *died, whoſe death I cannot reckon for an Infelicity to the Church of* England. *For being* ill-principled in himſelf, *and eaſily inclin'd to embrace ſuch Counſels as were offered to him, it is not to be thought but that the reſt of the Biſhopricks (before ſufficiently impoveriſhed) muſt have followed* Durham, *and the poor Church be left as deſtitute of Lands and Ornaments, as when ſhe came into the world in her natural Nakedneſs.*

From theſe words of *Heylin* 'tis evident, That ſuch as are of this *Grotian* Faction, do reflect ſufficiently on the Reformation then begun, and alſo plainly enough ſuggeſt, That if K. *Edward* had lived longer, the Reformation had gone on further than you or your party deſire; it may be they would have gone on ſo far as thoſe you now call *Schiſmaticks*. If ſo, how comes it to paſs that the Diſſenters by acting ſo agreeably to what King *Edwards* Proteſtants would have done, caſt any reproach on that ſo happily begun Reformation?

In fine, It cannot but amuſe wiſe men, to obſerve how prudently Dr. *Stillingfleet* and his Subſtitute inſiſt on the Diſſenters ſubſerviency to the *Popiſh* Intereſt: Whereas 'tis moſt manifeſt, that the *Papiſts* themſelves do with the greateſt confidence conclude none more oppoſite, nor more injurious to their Deſigns than the Diſſenter. However, ſeeing one Diſſenter ſpake but a word for the forbearance of a meer conſcientious Papiſt, this is enough to animate thoſe Gentlemen to load the whole Party with the reproach of being great friends to Popery. The which is the more remarkable, becauſe all this cry is even when a Son of the Church, yea a Reverend Divine of that name hath written a Volume in favour of the Church (though not of the Court) of *Rome*, without any notice taken of it. And the Dean himſelf in that very Preface in which he ſo much declaims againſt the Diſſenter, doth ſpeak much more in favour of the *Papiſts*, than any Diſſenter ever did; for he himſelf aſſerts, *That it will be thought great hardſhip when mens heats are over, for them only* (viz. the

the Papiſts) *to be deprived of the liberty of their Conſciences, when the wildeſt Fanaticks are allow'd it.* p. 79.

Moreover, what is matter of greater ſurpriſe is, That all this ſtir is rais'd from one word out of a Diſſenters mouth, even when great things have been done by ſome who pretend to be ſons of the Church, in favour of the Papiſt, to the turning the edg of thoſe Laws that were made againſt *Papiſts* on Proteſtant Diſſenters, without any remark; as if it had been highly meritorious in a Church-man to act for all *Papiſts* in the general, tho' an unpardonable crime in a Diſſenter to ſpeak but one word for the ſuppoſed conſcientious only.

That ſome of the Church of *England* have acted in favour of all ſorts of *Papiſts*, to the advancing *Popery*, is notorious, as hath been obſerved by Sir *Francis Winnington* at the Trial of the Lord *Stafford*. *Another encouragement, my Lord* (ſaith Sir *Fr.W.*) *which the Papiſts had, was, That by the means of thoſe Miniſters who were ſecretly of their Faction, whenever his Majeſty was pleaſed to command the Laws made againſt them in the Reign of Q.* Elizabeth *and K.* James, *to be put in due execution, his good intentions were fruſtrated, and the ſeverity of thoſe Laws was turn'd upon the* Proteſtant Diſſenters. *This was a Maſter-piece of* Rome, *not only to divert from themſelves the edg of thoſe* Laws *which were deſign'd againſt them; but to turn them upon the* Proteſtants, *and to make them uſeful to advance the* Romiſh *Intereſt.*

The ſame is alſo the ſenſe of the *Commons* aſſembled in *Parliament*, as is to be ſeen in their Addreſs unto his *Majeſty, November* 29. 1680. where they declare unto his Majeſty in theſe words, *At home, if your Majeſty did at any time by the advice of your Privy Council, or of your Two Houſes of Parliament, command the Laws to be put in execution againſt* Papiſts, *even from thence they gain'd advantage to their Party, while the edg of thoſe Laws was turned againſt* Proteſtant Diſſenters, *and the* Papiſts *eſcap'd in a manner untouch'd.*

Thus many a Son of the Church have heretofore taken an eſpecial

especial care to turn the edg of Laws against *Popery*, on the *Dissenter*. But this is not speaking for a forbearance; 'tis but an actual affording forbearance to 'em all in general. Of which one word must not be spoke. As if such men as our Author would that all the Respects which are had for *Papists*, must be confin'd to them, who alone without offence may shew it 'em.

But 'tis pretty evident, that there are other *Conformists* of another mind, as may appear by the *Countrey-Conformists further Reply* to this *Defence*, or *Vindication*, which we have received from him in these Sheets following, and to which I refer my Reader.

FINIS.

Mr.

Mr. *PARKHURST*,

HAVING information that you are Printing ſome Papers of others in Anſwer to the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, I have thought fit upon advice to ſend you theſe three or four ſheets to put in, as one concern'd among the reſt.

The young *Hero* that hath written this Defence, hath treated his Antagoniſts with no leſs a ſupercilious contempt than the Dr.; but he hath not written his Book with the like judgment and ſenſe. I cannot ſay that he hath in any thing confuted them; but he doth groſly pervert their words, and give them a meaning which is contrary to their intention, and then drolls upon it, and mightily pleaſes himſelf in his Victory and Succeſs. And this he hath done almoſt throughout his Book.

He that reads the Book, and doth not compare it with the Authors whom he pretends to Anſwer, may perhaps think there is ſomething in it: But if he ſhall diligently do this, he will alter his opinion. I will inſtance in one particular: Mr. *Baxter*, among other things, objects the renunciation of the Covenant for our *ſelves* and *others*, when *we know not their ſenſe*. Theſe laſt words he interprets of the *Takers* of that Covenant, when Mr. *B.* meant it of the *Impoſers*; and no wonder then if he makes fine work of it.

The Author of the *Reflections* hath reaſon to take notice of theſe his dealings in this kind; and I do foreſee how he is like to fare again; yet being one for whom I have ſo near a concern, I cannot refuſe a ſheet or two (having this intimation) in his behalf, eſpecially ſeeing he is a Son of the Church; and 'tis convenient his Brethren ſhould rightly underſtand him.

It is in the Preface I am engaged; and (p. 3.) thus he begins.

gins. *The Countrey Conformist in his Reflections on Dr.* Stillingfleet, *endeavours to excuse Mr.* B. *from intending the D. of St.* Pauls, *in that lewd character that he gave, of a most unskilful, proud, partial, obstinate, impertinent Adversary, by making it the description of such Substitutes as had neither the Candor nor Learning of the Doctor.*

He did so; and how doth this Gentleman prove that he endeavoured it to no purpose? Why even thus: *However any impartial Reader will see cause to believe, that Mr.* B. *had the Dean in his eye, tho' he had not courage enough to apply every thing to him, but left his Readers to apply as much as they pleased.*

To which I reply, There's no Impartial Reader can believe that Mr. *B.* intended the Dr. in that lewd Character, as he is pleased to call it; and it is a rare faculty this Author hath of misrepresenting the words of other men, and to put his sense upon them as he lists, and then brazen it out. I will add withall, that it seems a little strange that Mr. *B.* that hath courage enough to *libel Church and State*, as this Author often says, and to *cast dirt upon the Church and Church-men*, as 'tis in his next page, should be afraid to apply to the Dr. any part of that Character which he thought did belong to him.

The Gentleman proceeds in the same page, *But suppose he meant this of such Substitutes as had neither the Candor nor Learning of the Dr. I reckon a man may fall many degrees short of the Dr. and yet not deserve such a character, or be unworthy of Mr.* B's *notice.*

Sir, the question is not, Whether a person may not fall many degrees short of the Dr. and yet not deserve that Character; but whether a person may not fall so far beneath him, as to deserve it, and yet officiously substitute himself in the place of the Learned Doctor; and whether such an one may not be unworthy of Mr. *B's* notice?

Our Author adds, p. 4. *As for the former* (i. e. *Candour*) *I confess a very great proportion of that is necessary for any man, that will treat Mr.* B. *with any tolerable Civility, when in all his late Writings he casts so much dirt upon the Church and Churchmen: And this Author will not allow the Dean himself any great share of that, though he has very sparingly, considering the frequent provocations,*

vocations, and very decently and modeſtly, conſidering the occaſions he takes for it, rebuked that huffing Diſputant.

To this I anſwer, That Mr. *B.* hath reproved the faults of Churchmen in words pretty plain and ſharp, I do eaſily acknowledge, (and ſo have ſome regular Sons of the Church done alſo; See *Englands faithful Reprover and Monitor*; and a Book called *Ichabod.*) But that he hath thrown dirt upon them, (unleſs ſpeaking truth be caſting dirt) I ſhall not eaſily grant; and I am of opinion, if this Author and ſome others had lived in the days of the old Prophets, yea and of the Son of God himſelf, and had heard their Sermons and Diſcourſes, they would have ſaid, That they Defamed the Governors of the *Church*, and Libelled the *State.*

That a great deal of candour is neceſſary for thoſe that will treat ſuch as reprove them with Civility, I do eaſily concede, yea and a great deal of Humility, Self-denial, Tenderneſs of Conſcience, and the fear of God too; But all this is no more than their Duty, and if they had any conſiderable meaſure or degree of theſe Virtues, they would find no great difficulty in treating ſuch as reprove them with Reſpect and Kindneſs.

As to what concerns the Learned Doctor, I have always eſteemed him, and do to this day, a perſon of Candour; but good men are ſometimes tranſported, and do ſuch things as are inconſiſtent with the habitual Temper and Conſtitution of their own Mindes: And I hope the excellent Dr. ſuffered ſome ſuch kind of Tranſport, when he replied to Mr. *B.* in his late Book.

That the Dr. did very ſparingly, decently and modeſtly rebuke Mr. *B.* which this Author calls a *huffing Diſputant*, I ſhall grant alſo, if the Doctor's rebukes be compared with this Authors. For he hath obſerved no Laws of Modeſty, Decency or Decorum therein, but after a moſt profuſe and ſcornful manner hath reproached and deſpiſed him, to his own greater Infamy and Reproach. For Mr. *B's* Reputation for Learning and Judgment is too firmly eſtabliſhed in the minds of Impartial and Unbiaſſed men, that all that he can ſay to abate it, will be but throwing water on a rock, that will return and daſh himſelf.

In the ſame page he addes, *As for the latter*, (*i. e.* Learning) *I acknowledg my ſelf ſuch a Subſtitute, as may not compare with the Doctor.*

This I think (bating the Texts of Scripture which he quotes) is one of the trueſt paſſages in all his Book; and I have a Veneration for truth, and will not ſpeak any thing to the diſadvantage of it; but let the Author have the honour of having ſpoke it once at leaſt in a Book of ſix or ſeven hundred Pages.

Page the 5th he ſays, 'I ſhall begin with the Reflecter, who 'writes himſelf a Conformiſt Miniſter in the Country; and this 'is the only thing conſiderable in it, that it is the teſtimony of 'one of our own Church againſt the Dean of St. *Pauls*, and for 'his adverſaries: And for that reaſon Mr. *B.* at the end of his 'Anſwers refers his Readers to him, that thoſe may receive 'that from a Conformiſt, which he will not receive from ſuch an 'one as he.

And then he addes; 'But what is this to the purpoſe? If 'there be ſome ſuch Conformiſts among us now, as there were 'in 1643, who raiſed a Church-War, and then pulled down 'Church and State, to ſet up a *Presbyterian* Party? and ſuch a 'Conformiſt our Reflecter is, who vindicates Mr. *B*'s Parochial 'Epiſcopacy, which is but a new name for Presbytery, as I 'have proved in the following Treatiſe.

To which I anſwer, I had thought our Author had begun with the Reflecter ſome time ſince; but peradventure what he hath hitherunto ſaid, hath been only like the ſlight velitations of the Avant-guards of an Army; he intends now to fall to down-right blows: Be it ſo, 'tis to be hoped the Reflecter may ſurvive his moſt powerful Impreſſions, and the rudeſt of his Aſſaults: For though he talks like one of the Sons of *Anak*, for ought that I can ſee, he *performs* as little, and ſomething leſs than other men, that do only but *talk*.

But to proceed to the matter; I will aſſure him, that the Countrey-Conformiſt gives no teſtimony againſt the Dean of St. *Pauls*, or for his Adverſaries, but out of the Love and Zeal that he hath for Peace. The *Church* of God in this Nation is broken into pieces, *Ephraim* is againſt *Manaſſeh*, and *Manaſſeh* againſt *Ephraim*; and this I dare ſay is indeed matter of ſad Meditation (for I know him very well) to the Countrey-Conformiſt, who hath no other Controverſie with the Reverend and Learned Doctor, than on the behalf of Peace.

As to what our Author ſays concerning thoſe Conformiſts that raiſed a War in 1643. and pulled down *Church* and *State*

to

to ſet up a *Presbyterian* parity, the *Countrey Conformiſt* hath nothing to ſay, unleſs it be to aſſure him, That as he had nothing to do in that, ſo he never intends to have any thing to do in another. He is no admirer of that which this Gentleman calls a *Presbyterian Parity*; he very well likes of *Dioceſan Epiſcopacy*, provided their Dioceſſes be no bigger than they were in the firſt two hundred years, yea, than they were in the third and fourth Centuries, in moſt parts of the Chriſtian world. Let us have but ſuch Churches and ſuch Biſhops, with *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, as were in the Churches of *Corinth*, *Jeruſalem*, and *Antioch*, in the days of *Clemens*, *James*, and *Ignatius*, and the *Countrey Conformiſt* is ſatisfied, and ſo would Mr. *B.* and moſt *Nonconformiſts* in *England* beſides. Whether this kind of *Epiſcopacy* be a new name for *Presbytery*, and whether this Author have proved it, I leave to ſuch *Readers* to judg, as can *conſider* as well as *read* his Book.

But how comes this Gentleman to know that the *Countrey Conformiſt* is ſuch a one as thoſe that raiſed a Civil War ſome years ago, and pulled down Church and State to ſet up a *Preſbytery*? Can a man oppoſe nothing that is defended by ſome Church-men, but he muſt immediately be reported a ſecret Traytor or Rebel? Is this becoming Chriſtianity, or the Preachers of it? Do theſe men believe the Goſpel, that dare ſlander and traduce their brethren in ſuch a *villanous* manner? 'Tis a word I received from him, I hope he will take it agen. Tho' it ſhould be granted the Miter ſupports the Crown; yet ſurely the Errors and Vices of Church-men give no ſupport unto it; and I am of opinion, that a man may ſpeak for peace, and againſt the opinions and corruption of Churches and Church-men, and yet be a very good ſubject to his Prince, notwithſtanding that perpetual buz of Rebellion that is ſuggeſted by ſome Huffs in the prejudice of ſuch men and their diſcourſes.

But why did I enquire how this *Monſieur* came to know that the *Countrey Conformiſt* was ſuch another as thoſe that raiſed the Rebellion in forty three? The nature of the aſſertion betrays the Author of the Information, and there needs no great skill in Magick to find him; yet leſt he ſhould be ignorant of him, I will be ſo kind as to tell his name, he is called *Beelzebub* the Father of lyes; and I hope when he writes agen, he will be-

ware of him, and hold better correſpondencies for his information.

Pag. 7. he adds : *Our Conformiſt doth plainly deride the Dean for thinking he can juſtifie our preſent Epiſcopacy*; and then quotes his words as followeth : *But the Dr. makes no queſtion but he ſhall confute this fanciful man, and make it appear, that our preſent Epiſcopacy (which Mr. B. oppoſes) is agreeable to the inſtitution of Chriſt, and the beſt and moſt flouriſhing Churches.* And eaſily he may, if Mr. *B.* be ſuch a pitiful Antagoniſt.

But what is there in theſe words that ſavour of deriſion? I have read and conſidered them agen and agen, and I cannot find it by all the ſearch that I can make. The Learned Dr. had pitied Mr. *B.* and given ſufficient evidence of the mean opinion he had of his performances in his late Books, and particularly in his Treatiſe of *Epiſcopacy*; and is it to deride the Dean to ſay, he may eaſily confute ſo contemptible an Adverſary? This I confeſs I cannot underſtand.

And yet after all I am not ſatisfied, that the Learned Dr. or his Defender hath confuted what Mr. *B.* hath ſaid in prejudice to our preſent Dioceſan Epiſcopacy; he ſays that the enlargement of Dioceſſes hath varied the ſpecies of Epiſcopacy; and gives many arguments for the proof of it, which neither the Dr. nor this Gentleman hath attempted to anſwer.

I know the latter of them ſays, that the enlargement of Dioceſſes doth not vary the ſpecies of Biſhops; and that a great and a little King are ſpecifically the ſame Governours: But I can by no means believe this to be true of Biſhops, whatever it be of Kings: For the Dioceſs of the Pope is only bigger than that of the Biſhop of *London*, or *Worceſter*, or *Lincoln*; and yet I think they are Governours ſpecifically diſtinct, and I hope this Gentleman thinks ſo too. Yea, give me leave to ſuppoſe that there were but two Biſhops in *England*, there would be only a gradual difference in their Dioceſs, and yet I ſuſpect ſome men would think that the Government were ſpecifically altered; but let not our Author infer that this ſuppoſition is my deſire (for he is apt to pervert mens words), for I will aſſure him, that I do not deſire it, but would have many more Biſhops, not leſs.

In fine, 'tis my opinion, that the needs of the Church, and the abilities of Biſhops to perform the work of the Epiſcopal Office, ought

ought to determine the extent of their Dioceſs. Let their Dioceſſes be as big as they can manage and no bigger, and if ſo, I am ſure they muſt be reduced to ſmaller limits than now they are. No Biſhop can diſcharge the proper work of his Office in a thouſand, or five hundred Pariſhes; nay, I will ſay, That there are many ſingle Pariſhes in *England* that will employ the moſt induſtrious Biſhops on earth.

If it be ſaid, that they do perform the proper work of their Office in many Pariſhes, I utterly deny it, that the work is not done, and thence proceeds the prophaneſs and wickedneſs of particular Churches; and thence follows the Schiſms, and Separations that have and do vex this Church at this day.

Pag. ib. Our Author proceeds: *He pleads* (i.e. the Countrey Conformiſt) *for taking off the Impoſitions* (in general without any limitation) to receive the Presbyterians again into our Church, which before he told us, *were Subſcriptions, Declarations*, &c. and *ſome few Alterations beſides: That is*, ſaith our Commentator, *either a form of Prayer, or at leaſt our preſent Liturgy, Ceremonies, and Adminiſtration of religious Offices: Now he is an admirable Conformiſt indeed, who at once grants away the Epiſcopal Office, and inſtead of it, ſetteth up a Biſhop in every Pariſh; or either an Anti-Chriſtian Biſhop of Biſhops, or an Eccleſiaſtical Miniſter of State to head and govern them, and alters the whole frame of our Worſhip; and into the bargain leaves every man to do as he ſaith, and all this without injuring our preſent Conſtitution: Nay he concludes, That all thoſe that hinder the Union of Presbyterians with this Church, by continuing the Impoſitions, are Factors for the Pope.*

In this Paragraph are a great many falſhoods. He charges the Countrey Conformiſt with pleading for the Admiſſion of the Presbyterians into the Church, without any Impoſitions, Subſcriptions, or Declarations. This was very ill done of him, if it be true, which I do a little ſuſpect, becauſe this Gentleman is ſo apt to miſunderſtand, and miſrepreſent the words and meaning of his Adverſaries. The Country Conformiſt hath declared in ſeveral places of his Books, That he pleads the Cauſe of none but *tolerable* Diſſenters; and for the Admiſſion of none into the Church, but ſuch as can Officiate in our Parochial Aſſemblies; but how this difference can be made without Impoſitions, or Subſcriptions, is not imaginable: And therefore to ſay no more,

I think this Author hath injur'd and wronged him, in this report of his judgment.

And whereas by thoſe *few Alterations beſides*, that the Country-Conformiſt ſpeaks of, he underſtands either a Form of Prayer, or the preſent Liturgy, Ceremonies, and Adminiſtration of Religious Offices, 'tis his own Comment, and he is not obliged to confute it. Yet thus much I will ſay on his behalf, that upon my knowledg, he is in his judgment for a Form of Prayer in Publique-Offices, and Adminiſtrations, and hath a very hearty eſteem for that of our *Church*; but I cannot ſay ſo of the Ceremonies; I think he might be eaſily perſwaded to part with them; and if ſome exceptionable paſſages in the Liturgy and Rubricks were altered, I believe he would make no oppoſition to it.

But he charges this *admirable Conformiſt* (as he is pleaſed to call him) with giving away at once the Epiſcopal Office, and inſtead of it ſets up a Biſhop in every Pariſh, and either an Antichriſtian Biſhop of Biſhops, or an Eccleſiaſtical Miniſter of State to govern them. How little there is of truth in this charge, may be collected from what I have ſaid already. The Conformiſt ſets up no more Biſhops than the neceſſities of the *Church* and the duty and work of the Epiſcopal-Office requires; and I underſtand not that this is giving away the Epiſcopal Office: And if this Author can free Metropolitan Biſhops from Antichriſtianiſm, which he ſays *ſome do derive from the very days of the Apoſtles, and that not without ſome good appearance of Reaſon*, I hope the Conformiſt will defend the *Epiſcopi Epiſcoporum* from that appellation.

As to what he ſays of an Eccleſiaſtical Miniſter of State, the Conformiſt hath no more to reply than this; He hopes this Gentleman will not plead an Exemption for the Clergy from under the Civil Magiſtrates Power and Government; and if this be granted, I know not what can be matter of Controverſie between him and this Author: For he ſuppoſes him to exerciſe no Power over the Biſhops, but what is inherent in the King, and in this Miniſter of State by Delegation; that is in few words, to ſee that they do their own Duty carefully, reprove their Negligence and Male-adminiſtrations, and preſerve peace among them. And what is there in this Doctrine that our

Author

Author ſhould take ſuch offence at, I am yet to ſeek.

He addes, *And alters the whole frame of our Worſhip, leaves every man to do as he liſts, and all this without injury to our preſent Conſtitution.* In theſe Lines, to ſpeak plainly, there is not one word of truth, as any man may eaſily collect from what I have ſaid already: And this Gentleman himſelf confeſſes in the next page, *That the Conformiſts will not indeed allow of univerſal Toleration.* How this can be reconciled with *Leaving all men to do as they liſt*, I am not able to tell.

That the Conformiſt ſaid, That thoſe that hinder the Union of *Presbyterians* with the *Church* of *England*, by continuing the Impoſitions, are Factors for the Pope, I do eaſily acknowledg, and I believe he is ſtill of the ſame minde; and as I remember he gave ſome Reaſons for it too, which this Gentleman takes no notice of. When he confutes them, perhaps he may hear of a Vindication, if there be juſt reaſon for it.

Pag. the 8th he proceeds thus; *He (i. e.* the Conform.) *pleads for the Indulgence of others, particularly the Independents, who*, he ſays, *will be content with their own Congregations, and is mightily taken with Mr.* Humfreys *Project, That the tolerated Churches (ſuch as Independents) be declared parts of the National Church, whereof the King to be the Head.*

The Countrey-Conformiſt is ſo great a Lover of Peace, that I do eaſily ſuppoſe he might be pleaſed with Mr. *H's Project*, as he calls it; and I do aſſure him, that I my ſelf am much more pleaſed with it, ſince I read his Book, than I was before, though I had always a value for it: For I think the Deſign of uniting the Diſſenting Proteſtants in this Nation, is into one National *Church*, whereof the King to be the Head, more laudable than the deſign of uniting Proteſtants in a General Council, or in a Pope, Primate, or Metropolitan, which ſeems to be the deſign of our Author, though he hath not Courage, or Inſtruction enough as yet to ſpeak it out.

For he affirms, 1. *That the Epiſcopal Office and Power is but one, and not reſident in the Biſhops of the Univerſal Church*, p. 212. 2. *That the Independency of Biſhops is inconſiſtent with Eccleſiaſtical Unity*, p. 115. *And* 3. *that although equals have no Authority over one the other, yet a Collegue hath Authority over any one of his Collegues*, p. 213. 4. *That the Bonds and Combinations of Churches*

are

are of Divine Right, though the ordering and determination of them be of Humane Prudence, p. 258. 5. *That the Unity of the Church is as much of Divine Right, as any Form of Government in it; and that the whole Church may be divided into greater or leſſer parts, as may beſt ſerve the ends of Peace and Unity. And that it ſeems ſtrange to him, that a National or Patriarchal Church ſhould not be thought as much a Divine Inſtitution, as any particular Church*, p. 259. And further he adds, *When Chriſt and his Apoſtles have inſtituted one Form of Government for all particular Churches, and commanded them all to live in Unity, Peace, Communion, and amicable Correſpondency with each other, the Union and Combination of Churches into one, according to this Inſtitution, to ſerve the ends of Catholick Communion, muſt be thought as much a Divine Inſtitution, as the bounds of particular Churches. For if we will not allow thoſe Churches to be of Divine Inſtitution, which have Officers of Divine Appointment, and are formed according to the general Directions of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, ſo as may ſerve the ends of Church-Government, I know not where to find a Church of Divine Inſtitution in the world*, pag. 259, 260.

Theſe are the words of our Author; from whence we may collect many things for our Information.

1. That the Biſhops of the Catholique Church are the regent part thereof, in the ſame ſenſe that the Biſhops of any National Church are the regent part of that Church: For although there be no Superiority among Biſhops, their Power and Office being the ſame; yet Independency among them being inconſiſtent with Eccleſiaſtical Unity, both in the National and in the Univerſal *Church*, they are bound to unite for the Government of both, and this by Divine Command, Authority and Obligation. 2. That whatſoever is determined by the Biſhops of the *Catholick Church*, doth oblige all particular Biſhops and all Chriſtians all the world over; provided they determine nothing contrary to the Word of God. 3. That whatever Biſhop ſhall refuſe their Canons and Determinations, and govern his particular Church by other Laws than they ſhall appoint, is a Schiſmatick, and they may Depoſe and Excommunicate him; yea, if a whole combination of Biſhops do refuſe to govern their National *Church* by their Laws, Appointments and Conſtitutions, they are all Schiſmaticks; and if the Nation refuſe to forſake ſuch Biſhops, they

they are all Schiſmaticks alſo, both they and their Biſhops are liable to the ſame Cenſure. 4. That the external Union of the *Catholick Church* conſiſts in their Union to and with the Biſhops thereof; that is, with a General Council. See *pag.* 595. where he makes *Catholick Communion* to conſiſt in two things; 1. *In the Agreement and Concord of the Biſhops of the Catholick Church among themſelves.* 2. *In the Communion of particular Churches and Chriſtians with each other.* And he adds, *That Catholick Communion is no arbitrary thing, but eſſential to the Church; and whoever violates it by an unreaſonable Diſſent, he is a Schiſmatick whoever he be, and no Member of the Catholick Church*, pag. 601. 5. That Metrapolitan & Patriarchal *Churches* are of Divine Appointment, as much as any other *Churches*, & muſt govern their *Churches* by ſuch Laws as are adviſed by a General Council, or by the Biſhops of the *Church* Univerſal; *For although they be not founded on any expreſs Divine Law, yet they are warranted by our obligations to Catholick Unity*, p. 293. And for my part, I am not able to ſee any reaſon, why the ſame obligations to Unity may not warrant one Papal *Church*, as well as three or four Patriarchal *Churches* in all the Chriſtian world. For the *Papiſts* think it the moſt effectual way to preſerve Unity, and for ought that I know they may think as wiſely as this Gentleman. I envy neither him nor them the pleaſure of their Dreams; but I hope there are but few *Church*-of-*England*-men that do think the ſame thoughts with him: theſe were the thoughts of *Hugo Grotius*, whom Biſhop *Bramhal* commends and defends: *Unitas antiſtitis optimum eſt adverſus Schiſma remedium, quod & Chriſtus monſtravit, & Experientia comprobavit.* Vid. Annot. in conſultat. de Religione, ad Art. Sept.

I have quoted the words of this Author, and I am not conſcious to my ſelf that I have perverted them, or made any ill deductions from them; and if it be his deſign to unite all *Proteſtants* in the Decrees of General Councils, and in the Intervals of Councils in the Pope, or three or four Patriarchs, who are to govern according to their Canons; I do aſſure him, that I prefer Mr. *Humfry*'s deſign far before it: For I am of opinion, 'tis a more Chriſtian Deſign to unite *Proteſtants* together and among themſelves, than to unite them with the *Papiſts*. Mr. *Humfry*'s Deſign I will tranſcribe from his Book, that thoſe

that ſhall read theſe few Sheets, may compare it with that of our Author.

'Archbiſhop *Uſher* hath left us his Model for an Accommoda-
'tion: And it hath been upon the hearts generally of all mode-
'rate perſons, that a reduction of ſuch a Government into our
'*Church*, as was in the Primitive Times, (when there was a
'*Conſeſſus Presbyterorum* joyn'd with the Biſhop in all his Acts of
'Ordination and Juriſdiction) were the way, and only effectual
'way to our true Happineſs and Reformation. Unto which,
'if one thing more might be added, that is, If the Common-
'Prayer might be new *caſt* (it being fit that ſuch a *veſſel* for the
'*Sanctuary* ſhould be all of *pure Gold*) ſo as the whole of it were
'compoſed of *Scripture-Phraſe* altogether, leaving nothing at all
'liable any more to exception, unleſs the Impoſition of a Form
'only, (which I doubt not but is alſo juſtifiable by Scripture-
'Inſtances, as well as ſound Reaſon) it might go near to put an
'end to all Diſſention among the Sober and Peaceable of the
'Nation.

'It is this I know is apt to recur into the Imaginations of
'good men; and foraſmuch as there was lately two *Bills* pre-
'pared for *Comprehenſion* (or Uniting the *Pooteſtants*), and for
'*Indulgence* (or repealing the Penal Statutes); I ſhall not, I hope,
'incur any blame, if I apprehend that ſuch men who are moſt
'conſiderate and intent upon the Intereſt of *God*, in what they
'ſeek, do, or did look upon either of ſuch *Bills*, as no other
'than an *Engliſh Interim*, preparative to this higher Concord
'and Union of the Biſhop with his Presbyters, according to the
'Primitive Pattern mentioned, aſſoon as more mellow Oppor-
'tunity, and well-adviſed Piety, ſhould adminiſter unto ſuch
'farther Perfection.

'Nevertheleſs, in regard there is no Uniting of a Nation can
'be ſuppoſed by any Model, but ſuch as is of *Human* Contri-
'vance; and there are multitudes of Holy and Learned Men in
'this Kingdom, that do believe the way of their *Gathered Congre-*
'*gations* is after a higher Pattern than this of Primitive Epiſco-
'pacy it ſelf, if there were any hope of the return of it; it is
'manifeſt that there is no Society, which is National in *England*,
'could be formed on theſe terms; becauſe theſe Congregatio-
'nal-men can never recede from that which is of *Divine Appoint-*

ment,

'*ment*, for the ſake of any *Antiquity* whatſoever. They do hold '*Particular Churches* to be of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, and *Dioceſan* of '*Eccleſiaſtical Conſent* only; and under the Notion of *Divine* '*Right*, it is Sin to them to ſubmit to any *Biſhop*.

'There is another Notion then that muſt be advanced to take 'in theſe good Men of *This Way*, as well as thoſe of the *Paro-* 'chial and *Dioceſan Way*, into one Political Body, for the making 'up the *National Church* of *England*, whereof the *King* is Head, 'as I have been ſpeaking; and that is, by an Act of Parliament '*Legitimating* theſe *Meetings* of the *Nonconformiſts*, ſo as to be- 'come thereby immediately *Parts* of the *Church*, as *National*, no 'leſs than *Parochial* Aſſemblies. It was a good thing in the '*Houſe of Commons*, that they were about to free many Innocent 'Men from the danger of the *Penal Statutes*; but the making 'ſuch Meetings to be *Legal*, is a Deſign of another Nature, of 'a far greater, nobler, and vaſt Importance. See page 28, 29, '30, 31. To which add what he ſays, pag. 36. 'If theſe *Sepa-* '*rate Aſſemblies* were made *Legal*, the Schiſm preſently, in re- 'ference to the National Church, were at an end. *Schiſm is a* '*Separation from that Church, whereof we ought, or are bound to* '*be Members: If the Supreme Authority then looſe our Obligation to* '*the Pariſh-Meeting, ſo that we are bound no longer, the* Iniquity '*upon that account is not to be* found, *and the Schiſm gone.* It is 'one Act of Parliament would give a full Anſwer to all mens 'Arguments.

Mr. *H.*'s deſign may be eaſily gathered from theſe words, which I have thus largely tranſcribed; and ſhould our Superi- ors favour and promote it, it would reſtore peace and quiet to a Church and State almoſt broken to pieces by diviſions, animo- ſities, fears and jealouſies: By this means the ſons of the Church might enjoy their Dignities, Preferments and Livings, and be- lieve their Government and Diſcipline to be of Divine right, and exerciſe it on all that are of the ſame apprehenſion and judg- ment: The Separate Congregations may enjoy their own opini- ons concerning their own Government and Churches; and all might live together in love, and every one ſit under his vine and fig-tree, and none make him afraid. A cloſer union I do eaſily grant were deſirable; but I am afraid this is all that is attaina- able in this Nation, yea and in the Chriſtian world (whatever

our Author may say to the contrary); and that those that will have more, shall have less. 'Tis with Christian Churches as 'tis with some weakly constituted bodies, if no violent remedies be used, they may drill out for many years; but if you will be tampering, and nothing will satisfie you but a perfect health, you will soon destroy them.

If Churches that have some defects may be endured, God may have some worship, and we may see some peace among Christians; but if like Ecclesiastical Mountebanks we will be perpetually trying experiments upon sickly and diseased Churches, we may disturb the peace of Christians, destroy the Churches, and leave few to call upon the name of God in the world.

What I have discoursed, I think may with some probability be expected from Mr. *H.*'s design. But can we expect so much from the design of this Gentleman? Or is there the least shadow for it? For my part I can see no such thing; he must have better eyes, or worse, than I have, that can see any advantage like to betide Protestants by uniting in a General Council, or in a Patriarch or Pope, ruling by the Canons thereof. And yet I think this is that our Author would be at. For he affirms, *That it is not enough or sufficient to Christian Unity, that the Christians of one Nation, or one Congregation be united among themselves, unless they be united to the Catholique Church: For if there be but one Church, a whole Nation may be Schismatical, as well as single persons*, &c. Well then, I am past all doubt that Protestants will never agree to the Canons of a General Council, nor to the Government of a Patriarch or Pope according to those Canons, and then they are all Schismaticks; and if the Princes in whose Dominions they live, can be prevailed withal to do it, they are to be Proscribed, Banished, sent to the Galleys and Mines, or be chastised at home by Axes and Halters: And I think this is a very pious and charitable Design, and becoming a Protestant Doctor, and Son of the *Church* of *England!*

But by the way, give me leave to add, that whereas this Gentleman hath undertaken to vindicate the Learned Dean of St. *Pauls*, from what Mr. *Humfrey* hath said against him, concerning the Constitutive Head of this National *Church*, I am shrewdly afraid that he has given up the Doctor's Cause, and left

it

it to ſhift for it ſelf as well as it can, or rather aſſerted that of his Adverſary. The Doctor had ſaid, *That we deny any need of a Conſtitutive Regent part, or one Formal Eccleſiaſtical Head as eſſential to a National Church.* This Mr. *H.* confutes, and this Author affirms and defends, but grants a *pars imperans & ſubdita*, or *a ruling and ruled part*, p. 567. *Church-Governours united, and governing by conſent*, ſays he, *are the governing part, Chriſtian people in obedience to the Laws of our Saviour, ſubmitting to ſuch Government, are the ruled part; and all this is true without a Conſtitutive Regent Head*, pag. ibid.

This methinks looks ſtrange! That the Biſhops by conſent (which conſent they are obliged to by the Laws of Chriſt) ſhould be the *pars imperans*, and yet not the Conſtitutive Regent Head, is in my opinion a Paradox: For I would fain learn, what it is that makes a Conſtitutive Regent Head to any Body; Is it not Right and Obligation to Rule? Doth not this make Kings and Princes Conſtitutive Heads of their Principalities and Kingdoms? And doth not this make Ariſtocracies and Democracies the eſſential Regent part of thoſe Commonwealths over which they do preſide? Have the Biſhops of this Nation Right and Obligation to rule all the Chriſtian People in it? This I think our Author will grant: And how he will deny them to be the Conſtitutive Head of the National Church, with any conſiſtency of Reaſon, I do not yet underſtand.

This Gentleman indeed ſays, *That though a National Church be one body, yet 'tis not ſuch a body as he* (Mr. *B.*) *deſcribes, nor can be according to its Original Conſtitution, which differs from Secular Forms of Government, by that ancient Church-Canon of our Saviour*, It ſhall not be ſo among you. And then adds, *A National Church, as governed by conſent, may be one body in an Eccleſiaſtical, though not in a Civil Political ſenſe.*

That it cannot be a Body, conſiſting of Head and Members in a Political ſenſe, according to Mr. *B*'s deſcription, I do not find proved by that Church-Canon of our Saviour.

That the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Forms of Government do differ, I readily grant; but are there no other Differences but ſuch as are eſſential?

A Regent formal Head and Members, is of the eſſence of political bodies, and that is no body that is without them, whate-

ver

ever this Gentleman says to the contrary. Many other defects are consistent with the being of Political bodies; but if they want a Head, they are no Body. The Church differs in many things from Civil Political bodies, and particularly in this, that it is not armed *with civil power and jurisdiction*, p. 566. by which I suppose this Author means Coercive power. But what then? Hath the Church no Constitutive Head, because it hath no Coercive power? or because it cannot imprison, fine, and destroy its members? Masters, and Parents, and Tutors, can't do these things, and yet most men think they are the Regent formal Heads of their Families, children and pupils. Well then, against that marvellous Oracle of our Author, *That a National Church governed by consent, may be a body in an Ecclesiastical, tho' not in a civil political sense*, (i. e. tho' it may be a Church, yet it cannot be a Commonwealth or Kingdom) I will advance this proposition, That a National Church is a body in a political sense, as well as in an Ecclesiastical, or else it is no body at all; and that according to his own doctrine. And if he will defend the Deans cause, he must write a book in his own confutation, which I think he ought to do in revenge on himself, that he hath hitherunto betrayed it, as the Dr. has the Church of *England*'s.

Our Author, I remember, somewhere calls Mr. *Humfrey* Mr. *Baxter*'s Eccho, when yet Mr. *Humfrey*'s Answer to the Drs. Book, came out before Mr. *Baxter*'s. When the Eccho now can be proved to go before the Voice, or the Voice to follow the Eccho, then shall the Deans determination of the question between him and them concerning the Constitutive Head of the National Church, be held as *unanswerable* as this Gentleman affirms it in one place, and as *admirable* as he cryes it up in another.

Having said thus much on the behalf of Mr. *H.* I shall add a few lines more before I return to the vindication of the *Countrey Conformist*. The learned D. of St. *Pauls* had charged the Nonconformists with joining with the Papists for a general Toleration; and as a proof of what he affirmed, produces some few passages from a Book written, (tho' not printed) by Mr. *H.* in the year 1675. and reprinted with some alterations 1680. Mr. *Humfrey* gives the reasons of those alterations, but withal affirms

firms that he altered not his opinion. At which our Author makes ſome exceptions (pag. 26. of his Preface), and ſeems to ſuſpect the truth of what Mr. *H.* had ſaid concerning the alteration of ſome lines in his Book, without altering his judgment in that caſe. Theſe are his words: *He will not own that he hath altered his judgment in the ſecond Impreſſion of his book, from what it was in the firſt: but people know not mens judgments but by their words; and the words of his firſt and ſecond Edition contain a very different and contrary ſenſe, which ſhould ſuppoſe ſome alteration.*

What a ſpiteful malignant inſinuation were this, if Mr. *H.* were not known to be one that does not lye! He perſiſts upon the words *like toleration*, which after Mr. *H.* hath explained, is nothing but cavil, and I need no more than to repeat Mr. *H*'s own words for the reproof of this Gentleman, who would not have omitted *theſe* when he cites *others*, if he had dealt honeſtly by him.

'The Dr. thinks or ſpeaks as if the Author (in reprinting the 'Book) had changed his opinion; wherein I account he is moſt 'of all out, and moſt to blame. He who drew up the Book, is 'not one of that humour, as to turn with the times, but rather 'againſt them. The opinion he offered in the year ---75. is the 'ſame that he holds now in the year ---80. Here is an alteration indeed, as to more words, or ſome other words, but the 'ſame opinion, or ſolution, with the difference only of a further 'explication of it, and nothing therein (beſides avoiding offence) 'intended. The Author had been wary in declaring the Toleration he propoſed, to be a limited one, and provided againſt 'the Jeſuit upon reaſon of State, and ſhewed his dread of Popery 'in dominion, but had omitted the diſtinction of a toleration, in 'regard to *publick* Aſſemblies, and the *private* exerciſe of a mans 'Religion. He explains himſelf therefore by way of ſupply, ſignifying that what he ſaid at firſt, ſhould be taken in regard to the tolerating the Papiſt only *privately*, as his meaning really was then, and 'is now but fuller expreſſed. This is the opinion he recedes not 'from (whether peculiar to himſelf, or not) *that no man ſhould 'be perſecuted meerly for his conſcience, if there be no other reaſon.* 'Whether he be a *Diſſenter* of one kind, or other, *the common 'rule of Chriſtianity muſt be remembred* (he ſays) *ſtill, that we do*

by

'by all men as we would be done by, and that with what measure we 'mete to others, it shall be measured to us again. These words are in all the Impressions.

And to this purpose I cannot but note what I find in Mr. *B's. 2d Def. p.* 16. who after he hath spoken of Mr. *H.* upon this account, as a man of known *Latitude*, and *Universal Charity, and discountenancing Cruelty*, adds concerning himself; *And I so little fear the noise of the Censorious, that even now, while tht Plot doth render them most odious, I freely say*; 1. *That I would have Papists used like men, and no worse than our own Defence requireth.* 2. *That I would have no man put to death for being a Priest.* 3. *I would not have them by any Law compelled to our Communion and Sacraments.* Nor can a man think but the Reverend Dean of St. *Pauls* himself had also some Compassion, Pity and Kindness for them, when he condemns such *Heats, as transport men beyond the just bounds of Prudence, Decency and Humanity towards their greatest Enemies*, Pref. pag. 34. And whereas this Gentleman objects, *That the alteration was not made in Mr.* H's *Book till five years after*, I hope there is a good reason for it, because it was so many years before the second Impression: and I know not by what means it could be altered till the Book was Printed a second time.

I return now to the *Countrey Conformist.* The Doctor had said in his *Pref. pag.* 78. upon the Principles of some of our Dissenting Brethren, Let the Constitution be made never so easie to themselves, yet others may make use of their grounds, and carry on their differences as high as ever. To which the Conformist had said, There was no doubt but insufferable Hereticks might pretend Conscience and many other things for Indulgence, as well as modest and tolerable Dissenters; but that he thought there was no reason that they should have the same Concessions; and that he hoped our Governours would be able to distinguish between those that erre in small things, and those that subvert the Christian Religion. This Answer doth not satisfie our Author, who enquires, (pag. 8.) *But in the mean time, how doth he answer the Deans Argument, that it is not the way to Peace, and Union, and to silence Differences?*

If I should reply to this Gentleman in other words, and give him another Answer, peradventure he may be unsatisfied, and ask

ask the ſame Queſtion again: However I'll venture this once. Many of the Diſſenters from the *Church* of *England* are ſound in their Judgments, and agree with us in all the great Eſſentials of the Chriſtian Religion, and in moſt of the Integrals alſo; theſe would gladly incorporate with us, but that there are ſome Impoſitions that they cannot ſubmit unto; now certainly if theſe things which are the reaſon and cauſe of the Difference between them and their Brethren were removed, the difference were at an end. Others there are that are men of ſound Judgments in the main Articles of the Chriſtian Religion, but cannot incorporate with us in the National *Church*; if theſe were Legally indulged, they would be free from fear, their minds would be at reſt; amidſt variety of Judgments and Practices, we might live together in Love and Peace. And thus I think I have told this Gentleman, how many of our differences may be ended, and how thoſe that cannot be ended, may yet be laid to ſleep, and perſons made amicable and friendly. As for intolerable Hereticks, I ſhall not be their Patron, only I would have them uſed like men, and that nothing be done to them that is unworthy of the Chriſtian Religion, which is made up in great part of Love, Kindneſs and Compaſſion: And if thus much Union and Peace will not ſatisfie this Author, I ſuppoſe he may look for it in Heaven, but I doubt that he will hardly find it in this world. I am of opinion, that a ceſſation of Differences among Chriſtians and Churches, and a total ceſſation of ſin, will appear at the ſame inſtant. I do ſomtimes admire, that thoſe that never expect to ſee the one upon Earth, but are very calm and patient without it, ſhould ſo paſſionately deſire the other, that they can be content to move Heaven and Earth for the obtaining of it. What *Seneca* ſaid of particular perſons, I ſay of Churches, *Optimus eſt qui minimis urgetur vitiis*; He is the beſt man that hath leaſt faults, and there are none without them. Thoſe are the beſt *Churches* which have the leaſt of defects and imperfections; ſuch as are without fault are not to be found out of Heaven. And as among men, the ſtrong muſt bear the Infirmities of the weak; ſo among Churches, the ſtrongeſt and moſt perfect muſt bear the Weakneſs and Infirmities of thoſe that are more defective and imperfect. If our Author ſhould ſay, that thoſe that I plead for and call *Churches*, are no *Churches*, but acompany of Schiſ-

matical Conventicles; I anſwer, I am of opinion, that they are as truly *Churches*, and parts of this National *Church* (or may be eaſily ſo made) as the *Churches* of *France*, *Holland*, *Geneva*, *Switzerland*, &c. are of the Univerſal: But if our Author ſhall pleaſe to cut them off from the Catholique (as I think according to his own Doctrine he muſt do) I ſhall permit him the liberty (for I know not how to hinder it) to cut off theſe from the National *Church*, having no mind at this time to debate the Juſtice of his Sentence. Only I will beg leave to tell him, that I can by no means believe, that what he doth on Earth will be ratified in Heaven; or that God will damn all that he gives up to the Devil.

If what hath been ſaid doth not ſatisfie our Gentleman; give me leave to ſuppoſe him a Miniſter of the Reformed Church in *France*, be it at *Charenton*, *Caen*, *Saumur*, or where you pleaſe, and let me ſuppoſe that ſome Gentlemen of the Roman Catholick Religion addreſs themſelves to him after this manner: Sir, We pity your ſtate and condition, and have a kindneſs for you, (for though you be an Heretick, you are one of human race) the King our Maſter will have but one Religion in his Kingdom, and you muſt comply with him, or elſe you are undone; your Eſtate, your Liberty, and peradventure your Life muſt all be ſacrificed to him, for he is reſolved, and peremptory in that reſolution; all muſt ſerve God the ſame way, or they muſt bear the puniſhment of refuſing it: Here are the Subſcriptions that are made by the Catholick Clergy, do but ſet your hand to them, and you're ſafe, and may ſhare with them in the Preferments of the *Church*.

To this our Author anſwers; Gentlemen, I bear an honour to our Puiſſant and Invincible Monarch, and am very ready to obey all his juſt commands; but in this particular I pray you have me excuſed, God is a King ſuperiour to our Prince, and muſt be obeyed before him. I fear His Majeſties Diſpleaſure and Vengeance, but I am much more afraid of that, of God; the one may hang or break me upon the wheel, but the other will damn me for evermore. I beſeech you therefore interpoſe with his Majeſty on the behalf of me and my Brethren, that we may have the ſame liberty of worſhipping God, as for many years paſt we have enjoyed under him and his Royal Predeceſſors;

We

We vow all Duty and Allegiance to his Perſon and Government; we will defend them with our Lives and Fortunes; and we have nothing ſo dear to us (unleſs it be our Conſciences) which we are not willing to ſacrifice for his juſt Honour and Advantage. The Subſcription you propoſe I cannot make, without the offence of God and my Conſcience: And I muſt beg his Majeſties Pardon, if I chuſe to obey the God of Heaven, before his Vicegerent here on earth.

The Catholick Gentlemen replies, His Majeſty is willing and reſolved to put an end to all Differences and Controverſies in Religion, he is weary of thoſe eternal Squabbles that are managed by Divines of different perſwaſions. The Temple of *Janus* ſhall be ſhut, he will have no more Religious Wars among his Subjects. To grant you the Liberty of ſerving God after your own way, is not a method of ending Differences, but of perpetuating them: For when you are pleaſed, others may ſucceed to you, and under pretence of Conſcience carry on Differences as high as ever.

Let our Author anſwer the Argument of theſe Catholick *Meſſieurs*, and I do humbly conceive I may be able from his own words to anſwer that of the Doctor, if it be not ſufficiently done already: but let him not miſunderſtand or pervert my words. I do not affirm that the Impoſitions in the *Church* of *England*, and thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* are equally wicked, burdenſome and offenſive; all that I ſay is, they are both unlawful in the judgment of thoſe that do refuſe them: and the Arguments againſt relaxing thoſe Impoſitions, or granting Liberty to thoſe that do refuſe them, are the ſame, and muſt receive the ſame Anſwers.

Pag. 9. The *Conformiſt* had ſaid, That he hoped our Governours would diſtinguiſh between thoſe that ſubvert the Chriſtian Faith, and thoſe that err in ſmall things. Our Gentleman anſwers: *Thus our Governours have diſtinguiſhed already, and yet it hath not put an end to our Controverſies; nor is he* (the Conformiſt) *ſure that once more diſtinguiſhing will do it.*

To which I reply, That when and where our Governours have made this diſtinction, I confeſs the *Country Conformiſt* is as ignorant as our Author will needs have him *in the Conſtitution of our Church*, p. 10. What particular perſons may have done,

I do not enquire; but what the Governours of our Church have done. They have determined the conditions of Communion, and upon what terms the Clergy may minister at the Altar; but where by any publick act they have distinguished between the great essentials of the Christian Religion which must be believed, and lesser errors that may be tolerated, I do not know, and cannot find. If this Gentleman thinks that all things imposed as conditions of Communion either upon Laity or Clergy in *England*, are of the essence of Christianity, and that all who have other apprehensions concerning them, are damnable Hereticks, let him enjoy his Faith to himself, I am not like to become his proselyte, nor I think many others.

P. 10. Our Author proceeds; *Will not the excluded parties cry as loud for Liberty of Conscience, and complain of persecution, as they do now? Either these are good arguments, or they are not? If they be, they will hold good in all cases, that men must not suffer for their consciences, but be allowed the free exercise of their Religion according to their own persuasions. If they be not, let them leave off the pretences of scruples and tender consciences, with that liberty and freedom in exercising their Religion which they challenge as their natural birthright, and demand no more of that, than what the merit of their Cause requires.*

In this discourse there are more strange things than one. 1. He declares, that if those arguments that are brought for free exercise of Religion, from scruple, and tenderness of Conscience, be good, they must be good in all cases. The meaning is this, One man doubts, whether it be lawful to use a Form of Prayer, another whether it be lawful to take the Sacrament kneeling, and the like. Now from these things therefore they plead for some condescentions. But no, saith our Author, if we humor and indulge you in this scruple, we must do the like by such as doubt, whether Jesus Christ be the Saviour of the world: for if the argument from scruple of Conscience, be good in one case, 'tis good in all cases. 2. He supposes their arguments may not be good; and what must they do then? Why, they must leave off their *pretences of scruple*, and *demand no more than the merit of their Cause requires.* But what is this? Doth their Cause deserve some liberty and indulgence, tho' the reasons they plead for it, be nothing worth? This I confess looks to me unaccountable.

I have

I have been always apt to think, that the merits of a Cauſe were neither more nor leſs than the reaſons that might be produced in favour of it. But cheer up *Nonconformiſts*, if you will but lay aſide all claim to indulgence, and ſay, you have no reaſon to claim any, you may have it.

Pag. Ib. Our Gentleman proceeds. *As for what he* (the Countrey Conformiſt) *adds about the difference between ſubverting Religion, and ſome ſmaller errors, as a juſt foundation for liberty, or reſtraint: Suppoſe our Governors ſhould think Schiſm as deſtructive to Religion, and the ſouls of men, as many hereſies are, it would be an unreaſonable thing to deſire them to eſtabliſh Schiſm by a Law; and yet if they did ſo, they would not be much miſtaken in it.*

I anſwer: The *Countrey Conformiſt* did ſay, that the difference between ſubverting Religion, and ſome ſmaller errors, is a juſt foundation for liberty and reſtraint; and I know nothing this Author hath ſaid in prejudice thereunto. Either all men of differing judgments and apprehenſions muſt have liberty, or only ſome. If all, then is this Gentleman a greater Patron for liberty than I. If only ſome, then muſt they be diſtinguiſhed by the opinions in which they differ, which is that Aſſertion the *Countrey Conformiſt* lays down.

If it be ſaid, That no difference in opinions muſt be tolerated, then no man muſt be endured: for I much doubt whether there be any two men in the world that are in all things of the ſame mind; and ſo every man's hand will be againſt every man, and the Chriſtian world will be a field of blood.

As to what our Author ſays in the next paragraph, (p. 11, 12.) of the *Countrey Conformiſt*'s Ignorance and Enmity to the *Church*, Partiality to Diſſenters, his charging the Dr. with haughtineſs, and apologizing for the rude and barbarous treating of an excellent perſon without provocation, I reply. The *Countrey Conformiſt* upon my knowledg is not ignorant of the Conſtitution of our Church; nor is he any Enemy to any thing in it, but its imperfections, and the pertinacity of thoſe Church-men that do in every thing defend it, and avow nothing in it needing Reformation. He hath no prejudice againſt the Dean, nor partiality for his Adverſaries, any further than he conceives the D.'s Adverſaries to have truth and right on their ſide, and him to be miſtaken. That the D. hath treated the Diſſenters ſeverely in his Ser-

mon,

mon, and his Adverſaries with haughtineſs and contempt in his Book, is not only the opinion of the *Countrey Conformiſt*, but the *ſorrow* of many others who are no enemies to him. He hath made no Apology for any thing that is rude and barbarous in the D's Adverſaries (for where that is, he doth not find): He hath only endeavoured to put a true and candid interpretation upon what was otherwiſe liable to be miſunderſtood.

To the next paragraph (p. 13.) I ſhall need to ſay nothing, ſeeing the Gentleman does confeſs that the paſſage quoted by the *Countrey Conformiſt* out of the Dean's Sermon was *ſharp*. And foraſmuch as he is brought to this, I am not for that *diverting entertainment* he would give me, in the enquiry *what uſage the Dr. hath met with* (from Mr. *B.* Mr. *A.* Mr. *H.*) *upon ſo little provocation*, as he accounts. There is one paſſage only in reference to the *Countrey Conformiſt*'s Apology for Mr. *Baxter*, as to his way of writing, that I muſt not paſs over. *If men* (ſays he) *revile and reproach without ſpite and anger, as much as other men can do with it; if a quick and earneſt temper of mind, and keen and pungent ſtile, make a man guilty of as unjuſt cenſures and opprobrious reflections as the moſt invenom'd ſpirit, what ſatisfaction is this to the injured perſon?*

To which I reply: How a man can revile and reproach without ſpite or anger, I confeſs I cannot tell. Our Saviour ſays, *Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth ſpeaketh*; but how a man may ſpeak plain Engliſh without either one or the other of theſe, and with no *invenomed ſpirit* at all, I can tell; and that is to ſpeak out of love and zeal to peace, and for the vindication of the innocent and depreſſed. And thus I hope have I, and Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *Humfrey* ſpoken, notwithſtanding the ſix next pages which are ſpent in expoſing ſome bare expreſſions of Mr. *Humfrey* (whom he hath alſo named, when he put not his name to his Book) without ſerving any end but the expoſing them, upon my ſaying that Mr. *H.* had done Mr. *Baxter* and the Dr. both right, in praiſing the one, and rebuking the other. Mr. *H.*'s *rebukes* (ſays he) *I confeſs are plain, how modeſt let others judg by a peruſal of ſome of them.*

Here he runs out ſix pages in citations. In anſwer to all which, I ſhall only make him this payment. *He hath cited*, I will

will *recite* Mr. *H.*'s expreſſions. He hath done nothing but cite them, to ſlur him: I ſhall need nothing but recite them for my *own*, and *his* full vindication.

'The Doctor is one who may look on himſelf to have Abili-
'ties in ſome regard, which Mr. *B.* hath not: But if he ſhould
'really value himſelf with Mr. *B.* upon the account of a pro-
'found Divine, he is a man who muſt want that Modeſty *in*
'*good earneſt*, whereof he makes a ſhew in the beginning of his
'Book, upon a compariſon of his with Biſhop *Jewell*. The
'Doctor hath his exceſſencies other ways, but he hath not Mr. *B*'s.
'The Doctor's Soul is made of Free-ſtone, you ſhall have from
'him *poliſhed Learning*. Mr. *B*'s is made of Flint, you ſhall have
'from him *acute Truth*. Mr. *B.* (I will ſay) is one, like the man
'in the Neighbourhood who is firſt up, and all the Neighbours
'come for fire to his houſe; that is, a man indeed *extraordinary*.
'From whom the preſent Age do fetch *Light*, and unto whom
'the Ages to come will bring *Honour*. Above all, Mr. *B.* is a holy
'man, who will be for ever greater in his once *refuſing* a Biſhop-
'rick, than the Doctor can be in *getting* one, if the preſent ill-
'managing this Cauſe doth not preclude his having any.

Theſe are ſome of Mr *H*'s expreſſions, and of Mr. *B*'s Cha-racter, and which in my opinion, are *weighed* as well as *written*. I ſhall only add on mine own part thoſe few words of the Apoſtle, *This witneſs is true*. And ſeeing I have quoted ſo much of that Learned mans words, in point of *equal judging*; I will not forbear the end of his Book, in point of *upright dealing*.

'The Dr. had no need to lay out his parts upon ſuch a De-
'ſign as that he hath under his hands; nor hath he reaſon to
'*deſpiſe* or *ſcorn*, no nor to *ſlight* or *neglect* the meaneſt perſon.
'For I muſt confeſs, 'tis matter of real offence to me, that a
'perſon who is ſo *learned* a man, ſo *honoured* a man throughout
'the Nation, ſhould prove a *proud man*, a *diſdainful perſon*; which
'temper if it be indulged, is ſo unendurable by God and man,
'that it will hurl any man into the duſt. And I cannot do any
'better ſervice in the earth to this otherwiſe very much worthy,
'and excellent Doctor, than to contribute the beſt I can to my ut-
'moſt, for the bringing him to ſome ingenuous ſenſe and Amend-
'ment of it. *Thou ſhalt not hate thy Brother in thy heart; but thou*

ſhalt

'*ſhalt in any wiſe rebuke him, and not ſuffer ſin upon him.* Anſwer 'to Dr. *Stillingfleet*, ſo far as concerns *the Peaceable Deſign.*

I ſhould now follow our Author to p. 20. where he returns to the *Countrey Conformiſt* (and there were ſome ſheets done), but becauſe it is indeed but endleſs, and it will turn to no account, but to eaſe my ſelf, I deſiſt.

Exiſtimat ejus Majeſtas (Rex Jacobus*) nullum ad in enndam Concordiam, breviorem fore viam, quam ſi diligenter ſeparentur neceſſaria a non neceſſariis, & ut de neceſſariis conveniat, omnis ope inſumatur: in non neceſſariis libertati Chriſtianæ locus detur.* Ep. Cauſaboni ad Card Perroniam, p. 31.

Author of the Reflections. *C. Conf.*

THE END.

Mr.

Mr. *Lob*,

I cannot tell whether it be beſt to meddle with this Book, or let it alone. The wiſe man ſays *Anſwer a man*, and *Anſwer not* a man. There may be reaſons to doe it, and reaſons to forbear. Nevertheleſs if you determine upon it as to *your part*, I have fetcht the Book, and taken my pen and lookt it over as to *mine*. There is but one Chapter wherein I am concern'd, and I have no mind to meddle with any more, though when I am writing I may point at ſome few things beſides.

Of all the Books that came out againſt Dr. *Stillingfleet's*, there are thoſe few ſheets called *Additional Remarks* which are ſome of the *leaſt* taken notice of, and of the *moſt* value. Not I count for the merits of the Controverſie, which is not to be expected from a Conformiſt, but for the ingenuity of Spirit which he hath ſhewn in ſo ſingular exemplary a charity towards the Diſſenter, and (what I count more peculiar) in ſuch a true candid reſpect to the Doctor, even while he takes ſo natural a freedom as he does with him, that the *fawning* (for ſo is applauſe to the riſing) of *this Authour*, is but alchimy to *his reprehenſion*. I am beholding I muſt confeſs to the Gentleman for my own part for his *Reflections*, but I muſt commend his *Additional Remarks*. I will commend them particularly to the Deans Defender, not for an *Anſwer*, but for his imitation. I do apprehend that in the writing his firſt ſheets, he was not ſo well aware of their being Printed as he was of the other, and that, that was the reaſon of the difference of the ſtyle in regard to the Doctor. It is a kindneſs this worthy good man hath done me by laying in a cenſure of my ſheets before hand, and ſo prevented the ſugillations of this Author. As I need not therefore, ſo I ſhall forbear any retortions of that kind, and addreſs my ſelf to my little taſk before me.

It begins, page 557. To *State* this matter, and to lay a *foundation* for an Anſwer to the Queſtion *what the Church of* England *is, and who is the Conſtitutive Regent part of it*, he diſtinguiſhes *between a National Church conſidered as a Church, and as incorporated in the State* (p. 558.) and then ſpeaks to both.

For this distinction, if he had said the *Church of Christ* may be considered *in its self*, and as *incorporated in the State*, it had been a good distinction, but to say the *National* Church may have this double consideration, it is not good, because the Church is *National* onely under the last consideration. The Church of Christ considered *in its self* is either *Universal* or *Particular*, but it must be considered as *incorporated in the State* to make it *National*. This quick Antagonist hath the sagacity to perceive this, and therefore cites these words of mine, page 559. 'To be Par-'ticular or Universal is Essential to Christs Church, but to be 'National is of Accidental consideration. *If this be true* (now says he) *then is my distinction* (that is this distinction) *quite out of doors, for it is a Church* (that is a National Church) *as it is the State* (as it is in the State, he should say,) *and Headed by the Civil Magistrate*. This is well, and what hath he then to object against me, and to say for himself?

Against me, he says, *There are two things* (p. 560.) *supposed in my Argument* (which he hath candidly delivered) *as necessary to the being of a National Church that are not necessary, That all the people* (that is the generality) *of the Nation should be Christian, and that the King should be so also*. These two things, I had said, were Accidental to the Church of Christ, and yet goe to the making our Church *National*, and consequently the Church of Christ is National onely under an *Accidental* consideration. But these two things he Objects are not to be supposed necessary to a National Church. I answer, when we speak of a National Church, our owne is always to be understood, about which the dispute is, and our Church is a National Political Church, no otherwise but upon this account, and the *supposition* hereof is *necessary* to it.

For himself, he says, *There were great Combinations before* Constantine's *days Patriarchal, Metropolitan, which are of the same nature with what we call National Churches*. I Answer, A *Patriarchal* Church, and a *Metropolitan* Church is not a Church *National*. A Patriarchate may contain in it the Christians of *many* Nations, A Metropolitan but *half* the Christians of *one*, and so the one is too big, and the other too little to be a National Church, and a Diocesan much less. By a National Church we commonly understand (I apprehend) a Political Church wherein

wherein all the particular Christians and Churches in a Nation, and these only, are combined under one Government, through the Supream Magistrate, to Church purposes. A Metropolitan Church is no combination of them *all*, and a Patriarchal a combination of *more* then all. The one and the other may be called *Churches*, but neither one or other a *National* Church, which he himself *takes* to be such a *Union*.

But he *cannot tell* (he says p. 561.) why it is Accidental to the Church of Christ to be *National* any more then to be *Universal* or *Patriarchal* and *Metropolitical* any more then Universal: but when I *tell him* that the Body of Christ (which is his Church) may subsist though there were never a Patriarch or Metropolitan in the Earth, I hope he can see (if he will) how the consideration of the Church as *Patriarchal* or *Metropolitical*, and so *National*, must be Accidental to it. And as for Christs command of planting Churches (p. 16.) in the whole world, and so in Nations, and Cities, and Towns, requiring Unity and Communion every where among Christians, it may warrant the Combinations of Patriarchal, Metropolitical, National, Diocesan, and Parochial Churches to this end, if he please, provided only, that these forms be held *Accidental forms* according to *humane* prudence, and not the *Essential form* of the Church of Christ according to *divine institution*.

To the question whether a National Church be Political, he offers something (p. 562.) and says the Dean in his Opinion hath answered with *great Judgment* in his denying *any necessity of a Constitutive Regent part to be Essential to a National Church*. But I will make it appear, that either the Dean or his Defender, do speak here with *little Judgment*. It is the Notion this Author hath proposed to publick consideration, that the Bishops in every Nation are to Govern the Church by consent, that is as Colleagues, *per litteras formatas* when they convene not, and when they do by their Canons in a Convocation. This he makes throughout his Book to be of Christs appointment, holding Episcopacy to be *Jure Divino* with others of his party. If this then be true, this Author hath found out a *Constitutive Regent part*, yea an *Ecclesiastical* Constitutive Regent part of the Church in every Nation, where there are Christians, and Bishops. And when he hath found out a Head for the Doctor, how can he thus applaud the Doctors answer, that denies the Church to have one, or says,

there is no neceſſity of any. When he does prove it to be a Church Political, and the Doctors anſwer includes a denyal of it to be ſo, how comes this man to be ſo full of reverence here with theſe words in his mouth? *To this the Dean anſwers, in my poor Opinion, with great Judgment and Conſideration.* It is with great Judgment indeed, is it not, that the Dean hath given up the Cauſe of the Biſhops? And with great Judgment, is it not, that this man hath aſſumed the Prerogative of the King to their Colledge? Let him take heed leaſt he bring himſelf into queſtion.

Many Churches Aſſociated for mutual help and concord, are a Church only in a looſe ſenſe; but thoſe that are conſtituted of one Regent and ſubdite part, are Churches in a Political proper ſenſe. It is no body Political without one common Governour Monarchical, Ariſtocratical, or Democratical. Thus ſays Mr. *Baxter* (p. 563.) Unto which ſays this Author, *Herein does his ſtrength* (p. 564.) *conſiſt.*

Anſw. I acknowledge it does, and what hath he to *weaken* it? I will Tranſcribe what he ſays: 'If we deny this, that though a 'National Church be one body, yet it is not ſuch a Political 'body as he deſcribes, (which differs from ſecular forms of Go-'vernment, by that ancient Canon of our Saviour, *It ſhall not 'be ſo among you*) the controverſie may be at an end, and a Na-'tional Church may be one body in an Eccleſiaſtical, though 'not in a Civil Political ſenſe.

This is the help the Dean muſt expect from his Defender, and if the Doctor be not aſhamed of his own anſwer for this defenſe ſake, I know not what ſhould put any man to ſhame. This man tells me in his Preface, he *will interpoſe between the Dean and ſhame in this Controverſie.* Upon this account therefore I will take leave to tell him, that he does here manifeſtly betray a raw ignorance which ought to ſhame him. He underſtands the term *Political* to be Commenſurate with *Civil*; as if a Government *Eccleſiaſtical* could not be Political, as well as a Government *Civil*; that is, as if a *Church* could not be *Political* as well as other *Societies.* He does yet diſcover the ſame more then by words; for he hath found out a Head for the Church which is *Ariſtocratical*, and yet thinks the Church cannot be *Political*, unleſs it have ſome Head that is *Perſonal*: or as if a Head *Collective* were not *One* Head, as vvell as one that is *Monarchical.* This man vvho hath interpoſed betvveen ſhame and

and the Doctor, must take ſhame upon him, ſeeing he calls upon me *to do my part honeſtly*, in the ſame place. I ſay this man hath found an Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutive Head of the Church, and that of Chriſts own Inſtitution, if he underſtands what he drives at; and yet he and the Doctor will not allow the Church of *England* to be Political. I will adviſe him to conſult with Biſhop *Gunning*, and the excellently learned, and yet humble Mr. *Dodwell* who are living, ſeeing he hath not taken his Notions from *Bramhal*, or any other who are dead, (as I conjecture) that he may be inſtructed better, before we hear any more from him.

Mr. *Baxter* indeed underſtands himſelf throughly, and tells us *Aſſociation of Churches for Concord (gratia Unitatis,) are no proper Churches:* But an *United Colledg of Biſhops for government (gratia Regiminis)* is a formal Eccleſiaſtical Head, about which was the Original Queſtion. And this, this bold, and herein but half informed Author (who will interpoſe between ſhame and the Doctor) doth not underſtand neither, and as ſoon as he hath read this, will he own the ſhame he hath taken upon him? Above all, is there any man (unleſs ſo forward a one) would ever have produced that ſaying of our Saviour, *It ſhall not be ſo among you*, for the proving a National Church to have no Head, or that the Churches of Chriſt muſt not therefore be Political? I ſhall not be blamed I hope therefore if I ſay now again what I ſaid to the Doctor; That if this man be not aſhamed for himſelf and the Doctor, I muſt be aſhamed for them both. If we deny this (ſays he) the Controverſie were at an end: Well, but when it cannot be denyed, we muſt look farther.

P. 565. *We grant* (ſays he) *a National Church is a Political Society; for Government by conſent without Superiority is Government. I grant too Church Governours united and governing by conſent are the* Pars Imperans, *and the people ſubmitting to ſuch Government in obedience to the Commands of our Saviour, are the* Pars Subdita, *and all this is true without a conſtitutive Kegent Head.* I Anſwer, if he grants (or rather aſſerts) thus much, *a Government by conſent*, underſtanding by it the Epiſcopal Colledg, or *Cyprians One Epiſcopacy* as the *Governing* part, and the People by the Law of Chriſt *ſubdite* to it, then hath he found out a Conſtitutive Head, and an Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutive Head by Chriſts Inſtitution:

and

and to ſay that *all this is true without one*, is to me a perfect contradiction.

When he goes on then (p. 566.) to prove that *this is all, that is, or can be required to make a National Church One*, by two Arguments, I anſwer, If there be *ſo much as this* indeed *required*, his two Arguments muſt prove it not onely to be *One*, but one *Political* proper Church with an Eccleſiaſtical *Conſtitutive* Regent part to it. *The Biſhops* (he ſays) *have equal power* by Chriſts appointment, *and rule not by Superiority, but by Conſent*, that is not by Superiority *over one another*, but they do rule by a *Superiority* (I hope) *over the people*, and that is an *Ariſtocratical* Government: and when the People do *conſent to Unite in Communion with them*, this makes them Members (he ſays) of that Political body: And theſe are his two reaſons (p. 566, and 567.) which need no other Animadverſion, but this notice of them. The great queſtions onely are whether this indeed be the will of Chriſt, that the Catholick, and ſo every National Church (as he ſtates the matter) ſhould be ruled by theſe Biſhops as Colleagues, that is by a *Government* (as he calls it) *by conſent*, and if it be, how it ſhould come to paſs that we have not in *England* ſuch a Government, where there is for certain no ſuch Rule *by conſent* of the Colledg *without a Superiority*, but *by a Superiority* (or a Supremacy) of the King, who is the Head of theſe Biſhops themſelves, as well as the Nation. This I make not my Province.

P. 568. He hath four things for the ſtrengthning the Government of his Mintage, and then concludes that *if Mr.* Baxter *can give him one reaſon why this may not be called one Church, or Eccleſiaſtical Body Politick without a Conſtitutive Regent part, he will think farther of it.* To which I anſwer; and tell him preſently why this cannot be called one Church or Eccleſiaſtical Body Politick *without* a Conſtitutive Regent part, the reaſon is, becauſe it is a Body Politick Eccleſiaſtical *with* a Conſtitutive Regent part; and ſo he need *think no farther of it.*

And this Anſwer being of another nature then that which he fancies like to be made him in the next page (p. 569.) I need ſay nothing to that, nor the next (p. 570.) but come on to p. 571. for now he hath *prepared the way*, as he ſays, to *juſtify* the Doctor. Well, where there is a Political Church ſays Mr.

Mr. *Baxter*, there muſt be a Conſtitutive Head. The Doctor anſwers, there may be *the true notion of a Church* without one. I Reply, This is a coming off, but the queſtion indeed at the bottome, is, whether it be the *true notion* of the *Church of* England?

The Doctor argues, *If it be neceſſary that every Church muſt have a Conſtitutive Regent part as eſſential to it, then it unavoidably follows, that there muſt be a Catholick Viſible Head to the Church Catholick Viſible.* This Argument the Deans Defender thinks *unanſwerable*. But we reply, the Argument is ſuch, as *needs no Anſwer*, and it may *eaſily be Anſwered*.

In the firſt place it needs no Anſwer, becauſe the thing it would prove, is but what we can grant him; that is, a *Viſible Head* to the *Catholick Church*. *Chriſt* is that *Head* we ſay, and he is *Viſible*. When he was on earth he gave Laws for his Church, and Commiſſionated Officers, which are *Rights* of a Head; He after appeared to *Paul*, and Commiſſionated him, and is now Viſible in Heaven. This is plain proof in Reaſon, Senſe and Scripture, and not to be jeered off, and therefore in the *firſt place* the Doctors Argument *needs no Anſwer*.

In the next place we ſay farther, *it is eaſily Anſwered*; for we deny the Argument. *If it be neceſſary for a Church to have a Conſtitutive Head*, it follows that the *Catholick Church* muſt have a *Conſtitutive one*: but it follows not that it muſt have a *Catholick Viſible Head* or that, that *Conſtitutive* Head muſt be *Viſible*.

This in truth is introducing four Terms into the Argument which we know is falſe Arguing. When there is put more into the thing Aſſerted in the Conſequence, then there is to prove it in the Antecedent in an Hypothetical Syllogiſme, it is all one as to argue with four terms in a Syllogiſm that is Categorical. But the Doctor (ſays he) puts more ſtrength in it. *The queſtion is about the Catholick Church, whereof particular Churches are parts, and they being Viſible do require the Conſtitutive Regent part to be Viſible.* I Anſwer, though here be more *words*, here is no more *ſtrength* put into the Argument, I ſtill deny the Conſequence. For though the *Catholick* Church conſiſts of *Particular* Churches which are *Viſible*, it conſiſts alſo of that *ſociety in heaven* which is *not Viſible*, Chriſts Body is but one Body, whereof part is *in Heaven*, and part *on Earth*, and while the Head is in Heaven,

it

it follows not, that becauſe part of the Body is Viſible, therefore the Head muſt be Viſible. It is all one as if he ſhould argue thus. Particular Churches are *on Earth*, and if Chriſt be Head of the Catholick Church whereof they are parts, he muſt not be *in Heaven*. And when indeed this is one and the ſame Argument, and we know it to be falſe, we do juſtly deny the Doctors Argument. Suppoſe a man ſo high as that his head reached above the clouds, will you argue, that this perſon hath no head, becauſe his head is not viſible? I deny the Argument.

There is really nothing hard in the Doctors Argument, but to underſtand why his Defender (whom I value for his Parts) ſhould come to think it *unanſwerable*. It may be the Doctors confident word at firſt, [*it undenyably follows*] drew on this apprehenſion, and he hath fetcht the Argument over ſo long, till he hath put enough in it, to make himſelf believe it. *We are far* (ſays he) *from aſſerting that the Univerſal Head muſt be Viſible if the Subordinate be ſo* (he ſhould be as far from aſſerting the Head to be Viſible, becauſe Particular Churches or the Members are ſo:) *but this we aſſert, that if no Church can be a true Viſible Church without a Subordinate Viſible Head, then the Univerſal Church cannot be a Viſible Church without a Subordinate Catholick Viſible Head*, p. 574, 575, 576. This he takes to be the Doctors Argument, and he will make the conſequence hold before he has done with it. But againſt whom does the Doctor and this man argue? Is it not againſt Mr. *Baxter*? and did Mr. *Baxter* ever ſay this, that there can be no true Church without a *Subordinate Head under Chriſt*? Is not Mr. *Baxter* a Proteſtant as well as the Doctor, and do they not both maintain the *Catholick Church* to have one onely *Supreme Head* and no *Subordinate* one in Earth? If his Defender hath found out one who is not the Pope, but the Colledge of Biſhops, I deſire Doctor *Stillingfleet* to appear above board, and to let us know whether he will ſet up alſo for that notion, and defend his Defender.

Mr. *Baxter* is a man who underſtood Politicks, and ſtated what he underſtood, but the Doctor was (at the preſent) raw, and put into his arguing he did not know well what (that is the truth on't,) and foraſmuch as this man hath undertaken to

interpoſe

interpoſe between ſhame and the Doctor. I will tell them both plainly, the Doctor may be aſhamed to put in a fourth Term into his Argument, and this man truly takes the ſhame on him, by bringing in a fifth alſo. That which Mr. *Baxter* ſaid, was this, *That every proper Political Church muſt have a Conſtitutive Head*, and the Doctor both leaves out the words *Proper, Political*, and brings in the term *Viſible*: *Therefore the Catholick Church* (ſays he) *muſt have a Conſtitutive Viſible Head.* The *Interpoſer* now to take off this ſhame from the Doctor, hath taken the right courſe (I ſay) for he comes and does worſe, and that is, puts in a fifth term alſo into the Argument. *If every Church* (when he ſhould ſay every Proper Political Church only, if he ſpeaks to Mr. *Baxter*) *muſt have a Viſible Subordinate Conſtitutive Head, then muſt the Catholick Church have ſuch a one:* But *that* having no ſuch a one, a *National* Church as well as the *Catholick* may be without a Conſtitutive Head. This is the Reaſoning in the ſumm (I ſay in the *ſum*, for it is no matter for more of his *words*) that puts me and Mr. *Baxter* (as he ſays) at ſuch a loſs, as is *irrecoverable.* And does he not indeed take off the ſhame from the Doctor by taking it thus upon himſelf? Suppoſe another ſhould put a ſixth term into the Argument, and argue, *If no Church can be a true Viſible Church without a Viſible Subordinate* Monarchical *Conſtitutive Head, then cannot the Catholick Church viſible be a true Church without a Viſible Subordinate* Monarchical *Conſtitutive Head*, Who could doubt now any longer but Mr. *Baxter* muſt yield to a plain Confutation, or bring in the Pope preſently without remedy? But did Mr. *Baxter* I pray lay down the *Propoſition*, from which, this *Conſequence*, by this means, is indeed made unavoidable? No, you will ſay this were to wrong Mr. *Baxter* to put in the term *Monarchical* (and would ſpoil this mans *Goverment by Conſent* quite:) I ſay likewiſe, that this Author wrongs him to put in this term *Subordinate*, and the Doctor by putting in the term *Viſible.* Mr. *Baxter* hath neither of theſe terms in his Aſſertion, and if you cannot argue from what he hath ſaid that the *Pope* is Head of the *Catholick Church Viſible*, you cannot argue from him that *it* hath any *Subordinate* Head, or *Viſible*, but a *Conſtitutive* Head only, whether *Viſible* or *Inviſible.* It is nothing elſe but the Fallacy whereby the Opponent puts in more into the Argument then is granted by the Reſpondent (which I

think we called at the Univerſity *Fallacia plurium interrogationum vel dictionum*, for whether the diverſe things are *interrogated* or *argued* the Paralogiſm is the ſame,) that hath made all this pother as this man phraſes it, which ſeeing it is on their ſide, I will give over any farther perſuit of this Chapter.

There is one thing only, and that is the main thing not to be omitted. The Dean in his Determination of this point does hold that *Conſent is ſufficient to the making a National Church*, underſtanding by that *Conſent*, a Conſent to be of it. The Deans Defender holds the Church to be a Government by *Conſent*, meaning by it the *Conſent of the Biſhops*. Theſe are two contrary things, the one making the Church *not Political*, and the other makes it an *Ariſtocracy*, and yet intends to juſtifie the former. But neither of them are in the right. The Church of *England*, is not a Church by *Conſent onely* without a Head, nor *a Government by Conſent*, by the Colledge of Biſhops: but it is a Political Church with a Conſtitutive Regent part, which is the King, according to my Papers.

That the King is the Head of it appears by the Statute that declares him *Head* of the Church, as it is called *the Church of England*. It appears by other *Acts* that give him the ſame Supremacy the Pope uſurped. It appears by the Firſt Fruits and Tenths of all Benefices given him as the Supream Head of the Church. It appears by *Cromwell* who was made *Henry* the Eigths Vicar General and Vicegerent, and ſate in the *Convocation* as Perſonating the Head of it. It appears by this Reaſon of my Book. Where the Rights of Majeſty are, there muſt the Headſhip be placed. *Legiſlation* and the *Laſt appeal* belong to him. It is the King gives Authority to the Canons, in ſo much as when a Law cannot paſs without a Parliament, the *Canons* becomes valid by the Kings own Ratification. And there can be no Appeal in any Eccleſiaſtical cauſe from the King. Again, it appears moſt unanimouſly by the Miniſters Prayers every Sunday, giving him the Title of Supream Head, and by the Oaths of Supremacy and Alleigance. If the King be not the Head accordingly, then muſt the Clergy generally be both Lyars and Perjured Perſons.

From this truth then (which is beyond oppoſition) it follows, that a National Church is of Humane appointment and not of Divine

Divine right that is indiſpenſible: It follows that it belongs not to the *Eſſence* of the *Church of Chriſt* to be *National*, but that this is a conſideration *accidental* to it. It follows that ſuch a Church may receive its Conſtitution at firſt, and a new form or mould at any time, as is moſt convenient to the State, and moſt conducive to the glory of God in the good of the People. It follows that a Reformation of the Government of our Church by the introducing ſome ſuch new form into it as ſhall be *more* conducive to the ends of Holineſs and Peace *than* the preſent Form does, were a moſt deſireable thing, and fit to be tendred to the Wiſdom of Parliament. It follows finally that ſeeing the model that is hammering by this Author is propoſed as ſtrictly of Divine Right, which is therefore the moſt direfull Schiſmatical Scheme that can be propoſed in regard to Diſſenters, excluding them thereby out of the body of Chriſt, and conſequently from ſalvation, beſides dangerous to the Supremacy of the Magiſtrate, and unanſwerably faulty in many reſpects, ſo that it cannot be received or indured, it is fit that a model more agreeable to the power which is proper to Kings, and leſs exceptionable in regard to the Conſcience of the Subject, were exhibited in the room of it; and if it be ſuch as would make the *Prelates* onely the *Kings* Officers *(to execute under him ſuch Government of the Church as belongeth to Kings*, as this Author ſo well expreſſes it, (p. 275.) ſo as the Nonconformiſt and Conformiſt may ſhare: I ſhall not for the diſlike of any one or two men, or party (who are deſigning an Antipodes to it) be at all out of love with it. And ſeeing there is a draught to this purpoſe which he alludes to, and (whatſoever the humor be) does ſtyle an *ingenious propoſal*, I adviſe that it be preſerved and inſerted therefore at the end of the Book if you Print it. The Paper (you know) was prepared againſt the Sitting of the laſt Parliament at *Oxford*, and Entituled *Materials for Union.*

And now I have done about my ſelf, you may expect from me ſome more general cenſure of the Author and his Book, which I was willing to decline.

For the Author (whatſoever he elſe be) I take him to be a man of Ability that requires our regard. By his Stile and Undertaking, I gueſs him to be a man of younger age, (ſo I hear and believe) though by his reading and compaſs he fetches for the making good his Notion, he may be ſome graver Perſon. In the ſmall

game he plays with me I perceive he hath hit me, and I ought not to like him the worſe for that. It is where I lay open to him, and left him a blot. But for the defence he makes of the Doctor againſt me, I think he hath failed in his caſt, and thrown out. He is a man I count hath a *Proud Pen*, and I am not moved at that: but the Doctor whoſe Pen is more Prudential, ſeemed to me to have his *contempt within*, and that moved me, do what I could, and made me write as I did. There are many (I believe) will think that this man hath deſpiſed me ſo much that it ſhould move me: but I do not think it ſo much. The man is a bold inſolent man, and it is (I think) the taking a ferocious liberty, rather then ſhewing diſdain. He hath uſed Mr. *Baxter* like a very dog, and when I methinks am but ſomething rightly ſerved, why ſhould I care how he uſes me? I will do nothing more to deſerve it, and if he deſpiſes me, I know then how to be even with him, I wont care if he does.

For the Book, I think the Bookſeller hath done his part. The Paper and Print is to be like't: but for the matter I think it to dear at the price. Five Shillings (I muſt tell him with ſome diſpleaſure) is too unreaſonable much for ſuch Controverſie. There are three or four things more particularly I have obſerved in the Reading it.

In the firſt place I obſerve the Deſign which appears to be in hand. A deſign which ſeems ſpecious, being for Union: but that Union is of the Church of *England* with the Church of *Rome*, in the *French* and *Caſſandrian* way, not a Union of Proteſtant Diſſenters and the Conformiſts with one another. On the contrary, this Gentleman thus diſcourſes. The Chriſtian Church throughout the whole world is One. The Unity of this Church Catholick lies in One Communion. This Communion is exerciſed in Particular Churches. There are no true Particular Churches of Chriſts Inſtitution, and parts of that Catholick, but they muſt have Biſhops. Every man conſequently that is not in Communion with his Biſhop, is out of the true Catholick Church which conſiſts of ſuch parts, and ſo not only a Schiſmatick, but cut off from Salvation. Either this Author now is aware of this Doctrine or not: If not, as ſoon as he comes to be, he will be aſhamed of it: if he already be, he may be aſhamed to own ſuch Doctrine as this is.

In

In the next place I obſerve a little, how conſiſtent he is in this Doctrine. For when he hath beſtowed a whole Chapter (p. 164.) to tell us that the Unity of the Univerſal Chriſtian Church conſiſts in *one Communion*, and deſcends to explain that Communion by a Communication of the ſame Divine Service (for when Dr. *Owen* is ſpeaking of a Communion between the Churches in Faith and Love, *He ought to have added* (ſays he) *in Religious Worſhip, for without this there is no Chriſtian Communion*, (p. 446.) which he alſo urges ſo far as to make a forſaking Communion with the Church of *England* to be a cutting a man quite off from the Church of Chriſt; and yet if you turn to *p.* 305. you ſhall find theſe words. *The Nature and Eſſence of the Church does not conſiſt in Religious Aſſemblies—— but it is a Covenant Relation to Chriſt which Conſtitutes the Church.* Here then we have ſounder Doctrine, for theſe two are different things. If an entring into Covenant with Chriſt is that really which Conſtitues a man a member, and unites him to the Body, then is it not this *One Communion* wherein the Unity of that Body does conſiſt. A man may give himſelf up to Chriſt I hope, who yet does not, and cannot communicate with the Church of *England*, and though he own not the Biſhops, may be a Chriſtian for all that.

In the third place I obſerve this, that when he hath ſaid ſome things well about the Text which the Doctor choſe for his Sermon (p. 447, 448.) yet is he very unſatisfactory in bringing off the Doctor, or vindicating his judgment in his choice of it for his purpoſe. There were ſome in the Apoſtles time that thought the Jewiſh Law ſtill obligatory, and that they ſhould ſin againſt God if they did not keep it: and there were others underſtood the liberty they had from it by the Goſpel. The *firſt* of theſe are called the *weak brother*, the *laſt* the *perfect*. The advice the Apoſtles gives to the *perfect* is to uſe and enjoy that liberty which the Goſpel brought them: The advice he gives the *weak*, is to wait till God ſhould reveal to them the knowledg of this liberty. And in the mean while that they ſhould forbear, ſeeing, *To them who eſteem any thing to be ſin, it is ſin:* and this he preſſes ſtill ſo far, and with ſuch exceeding caution that the ſtrong Chriſtian himſelf muſt refrain his liberty for their ſakes, in caſe that by his example he ſhall give them occaſion to doe the ſame thing, which in regard to their not yet ſufficiently informed

formed conſciences would be ſin, and deſtroy their ſouls. This is the certain ſenſe and diffuſive doctrine of St. *Paul* in his Epiſtles. I will come then to the Doctors Text, *Whereto we have attained let us walk by the ſame rule, let us mind the ſame thing*, and I muſt ask his Defender whether the *weak* and *perfect* Chriſtian (as before explained) be here both included, I mean whether both of theſe are alike required in the Text to *walk by the ſame rule?* This Author does hold it, and he frames ſuch an interpretation of the words as he muſt hold it: but I deny it, and that interpretation therefore muſt be counterfeit. By *walking by the ſame rule* he underſtands the *maintaining Church Communion*, and this Communion with the Church he counts muſt be held, howſoever it be we differ. This is therefore a fictitious and certain falſe application or explication of the Text, for it is directly contrary to the ſcope of that Doctrine which I have but now delivered as the ſummc or ſubſtance of the Apoſtle in his Epiſtles altogether. I ſay alſo that this is manifeſtly here deſtitute of reaſon. The Apoſtle requires that all Chriſtians ſhould *walk by the ſame rule in things whereto they have attained*, Therefore they muſt walk by the ſame rule in things whereto they have *not attained*. Such is his force. This *walking by the ſame rule* I am perſwaded is a phraſe or expreſſion onely, ſignifying *the doing as others doe*. Now becauſe they that had the knowledg of their liberty might doe as others did, and were to uſe it, muſt thoſe that had not that knowledg do ſo likewiſe? The contrary is apparent, for they ſhall ſin againſt their conſciences if they doe. The like caſe is here. The Conformiſt among us looks upon all and every of thoſe things that are injoyned about Uniformity in the Church to be lawfull, and he values himſelf for *perfect* in this diſcerning indifferent things, but the Nonconformiſt thinks theſe things unlawfull, and that he ſhall ſin if he yields to them, and what if herein he be *weak*, muſt the weak and perfect, muſt both theſe here now *walk by the ſame rule*, or *do as one another do?* Nay muſt there be a Rule made on purpoſe by Authority about theſe very things wherein the difference lies to force them to act both alike, when one of them (if they do) cannot poſſibly act in faith, and ſo muſt needs ſin? Nothing more contrary to what I have laid down, Nothing more contrary to the Doctrine of the Apoſtle. I will add, if by this *Rule* there be more meant then a Phraſe,

a Phraſe, and ſome Rule he will account there muſt be, I would fain know why this *Rule* ſhould be any other then that of the ſame Apoſtle otherwhere, *As many as walk according to this rule, peace be upon them and the Iſrael of God.* And what is that *Rule*, but Chriſtianity it ſelf, the great Rule of the Chriſtian Religion, or Doctrine of the Goſpel? And what then will follow from thence! The Doctor I remember reflects upon my *Peaceable Deſign* for being called an *Anſwer to his Sermon:* I will undertake now upon this Suppoſition, that, *that Title* was as *fit* for *my Book*, as *this Text* was for *his Sermon.* Becauſe we muſt walk according to the general rule of the Chriſtian Religion, in all things that are required of us, as we attain to the knowledg thereof, Therefore we muſt Conform to the Canons and Liturgy of the Church of *England.* This is the Doctors Sermon upon that Text; and I will tell you the Inference now of his Defender upon that Sermon, Therefore muſt all that *Conform not*, in the excluding themſelves from Communion with the Church of *England*, be excluded alſo out of the Catholick Church, and conſequently out of the Kingdome of Heaven.

By the way, ſince I wrote this, I was reading Doctor *Owen*, and I find that he falls in with the laſt Interpretation of the *Rule*, and he hath theſe words upon it. *Let the Apoſtles rule be produced* (ſays he) *with any probability of proof to be his, and we are ready to ſubſcribe and conform to it.* To which Doctor *Stillingfleet* Replies, 'This is the Apoſtles rule, to go as far as they can, 'and if they can go no farther to ſit down, and not to break the 'peace of the Church. Unto this Dr. *Owen* Anſwers, *The Apoſtles rule is not that we ſhould go as far as we can, but that ſo far as we have attained we muſt walk by the ſame rule.* I interpoſe here and ſay to the Doctor, This *is*, this *muſt* be the rule of the Apoſtle, ſuppoſing that rule be meant as he underſtands it, that is, of the *great rule of faith and love*, or law of the Goſpel. For this is part of *that Rule.* It is part of *that love* we owe the Magiſtrate and our Conforming Brethren *to go as far as we can*, or to come as near as we can to them. But I anſwer then to the Dean, It is part alſo of the ſame Rule *to go no farther then we can.* Our duty of *love* requires the *one:* Our duty of *faith* requires the *other.* We may not doe any thing which we cannot doe in faith but we break the rule as it is the *rule of faith*, as well

as

as if we do not doe what we can, we ſhall break the rule, as if is the *rule of love*. Whatſoever is not of faith is ſin. Now when the Dean hereupon goes on, and teaches us, that *we muſt ſit down and not break the peace of the Church when we can go no farther*, I Reply, there is a breaking the peace of the Church in *his* ſenſe, or in *ours*. If we underſtand *breaking the peace of the Church* in his ſenſe, which is going from the Church to our Meetings, I ſay he is out, and that we muſt *break the peace of the Church* if this be the breaking it, for this is that which is required of us in that branch of the Rule, that *we muſt go no farther then we can:* But when we go to private Meetings and leave the Church in this caſe (where we ſuppoſe a man cannot act *in faith*, or with perſwaſion in his conſcience that it is lawful for him to go thither,) it is no breaking the peace of the Church in our ſenſe, but a part of our duty (wee ſay) of going *no farther then we can*. We go as far as we can with them in holding the ſame Doctrine and Sacraments, in acknowledging them as true Churches, maintaining a Communion in love with them, and doing all the good offices we can to them, and when we *can go no farther*, in this lyes our duty of going *no farther then we can*, that we meet for worſhip otherwhere. To aſſemble (I ſay) for worſhip is one part of the rule: Not to aſſemble, (but to forbear any thing,) when we cannot act in faith, is another part of the rule: Put them both together and it comes to this, that, To go to other meetings when we cannot go to Church muſt be walking by the rule (if this rule be the great rule of faith and of love) out of queſtion. This I ſpeak in the perſon of Doctor *Owen*, who can and do go to Church my ſelf: but there is one eminent thing ſaid by that eminent great man, and very much accompliſhed Doctor. *We do and ſhall abide by this Principle* (p. 250.) *that Communion in faith and love with the adminiſtration of the ſame Sacraments is ſufficient to preſerve all Chriſtians from the guilt of Schiſm, though they cannot communicate together in ſome rites and rules of Worſhip and Order*. If the Doctor makes good this, he does our work: and till the Dean debates this, he ſays nothing.

To return, I obſerve in the fourth place (for the Digreſſion it ſelf does but lead me hither) that this Authour does induſtriouſly endeavour to bring the Controverſie between Conformiſt

and

and Nonconformiſt to this iſſue. If the Church requires of us any things as neceſſary to her Communion which are ſinful, the ſchiſm is on her part. If not, the ſchiſm is on ours. To what end he does this, unleſs there be ſome body elſe entertaining the task which the Doctor ought, I cannot tell: but if this be ſuppoſed the true caſe between us, then ſhould the buſineſs here that Doctor *Stillingfleet* had to doe, have been this, To ſee what things are alledged by the Nonconformiſts as Unlawful in the point of Conformity (whereof there was a taſt firſt in the Peaceable Deſign, and a fuller meaſure after in Mr. *Baxters* Plea) and then to have anſwered thoſe Allegations. If the Doctor was able ſincerely and ſubſtantially to have done this, then hath he declined his work: if indeed he cannot (at leaſt on the Miniſters part he cannot), then hath he yielded the Nonconformiſt his Cauſe. The Doctors Defender ſeeing this, does endeavour to ſupply his defect, and ſpeaks to many of theſe things: but I muſt tell him he has done it in ſuch an overly way, with ſuch miſrepreſentation of Mr. *Baxter*, ſuch incidental miſtakes, ſuch ſlight and perfunctory anſwers, that I do not apprehend he believes in his heart that what he hath ſaid can give ſatisfaction. I will content my ſelf with one inſtance to ſhew him this. It is in the matter of Aſſent and Conſent, *to all and every thing contained in, and preſcribed by* the two Books of the Liturgy and Orders. 'Tis plain by theſe words, that whatſoever is *Aſſerted* in theſe Books we muſt give our aſſent to the *truth* of it, as whatſoever is *preſcribed* we muſt conſent to the *uſe of it*. How vaſt a Field then have we here for our Objections againſt this Declaration, and yet does this Author come off thus. *We do not give our aſſent to every ſaying in the Common Prayer Book, but to every thing contained in and preſcribed by it, that is what we are bound to uſe*, p. 105. And does this man now think indeed this enough to ſatisfie a Conſcientious man in any thing which he ſcruples upon this account? Is this diſtinction enough to ſalve the matter? We do not aſſent to the *Sayings* of the Book but to the *Things*? as if whatſoever is *ſaid* in the Book were not *ſomething* that is *contained in it*: Or as if there was nothing to be aſſented to as true, but what is *preſcribed* to be uſed. Good Lord! what Healers are we like to have of ſuch men as theſe be? They ſhould ſet themſelves to *ſatisfie us*, in ſuch Solutions of our Objections, as our Conſciences being convinced of the Solidity

might acquieſs in them: but their care is only to *ſatisfie themſelves*, and no matter ſo long as they come off with any *Evaſion*.

In the laſt place, there remains ſome paſſages this Author hath here and there in his Book, and more induſtriouſly in his Preface, on ſet purpoſe to expoſe me, in an ill repreſenting ſome of my expreſſions, without regard to the *matter* between us, whether it be any thing or nothing; which though it can *hardly be well* (as to me) to aſperſe a man for the aſperſion ſake, (when as to Mr. *Baxter* it is (I Judge) even *irreligiouſly ill*) yet do I readily forgive it him, upon this double account. The *one* is, becauſe when I wrote theſe ſheets I think I was to blame, that having written them foul, I could not abide to be at the pains to write them over fair, (which yet I thought to have done) and then I ſhould have caſtigated ſuch expreſſions, that now in his expoſing them again to me do not like me (ſome of them), as indeed not *cautious* enough for *my ſelf*, or *reſpectful* enough for the *Doctor*. I am ready to crave the Doctors pardon, which is my beſt ſatisfaction for that. The *other* is becauſe the Author does it out of reſpect to ſo worthy a perſon as him he vindicates (not out of malice to me), and one may think it but a friendly Office for him to do ſo: But I do think alſo that Dr. *Stillingfleet* himſelf ought not to paſs it ſo lightly, who hath the more cauſe to be aware of him, and to ſay the rather, *Get thee behind me Sherlock*, thou art one that wouldſt foment my pride, when others (I am to believe) have more honeſtly endeavoured to let me ſee it, that I may be humbled to God for it.

If it was meerly for peace ſake, and out of tenderneſs to the Nonconformiſts, ſeeking their good at his heart as in the ſight of God, that Dr. *Stillingfleet* Preached his Sermon, and writ his Book, the good Lord pardon every man that hath had but one hard thought, or ſpake one hard word of ſo good and learned a man: but if it was really otherwiſe, if it was to appear ſome body, to ſeek himſelf, and in lifting himſelf up againſt his Brethren without regard to the conſequence, the righteous God is ready to take the leaſt hurt he does them to be all one as done to himſelf, then the good Lord pardon him (for he hath ſinned much), and bring him to ſee (though at laſt) unto whom he is indeed more beholding (or from whom he is indeed like to receive moſt good), either him that *licketh up his ſpittle*, or him that hath *rebuked his fault*.

The Author of the Peaceable Deſign.

Materials

Materials for *Union.*

WHereas there are three Parties of *Proteſtants* in the Nation, the *Epiſcopalian*, the *Presbyterian*, and the *Independent* (or *Congregational*-Men, which are of diverſe ſorts) who do, and will ever differ in their Opinions about the *Church*, and *Diſcipline* of it, in the Queſtion, which is of Chriſt's Inſtitution; or, Whether the One, or the Other, is moſt conſonant to Scripture: it is not our Diſputes about the Church as *Particular* (which are rather to be mutually forborn, and every Party (left herein to their own Perſwaſion) but a Common Agreement in what we *Can* Agree, and that is in the Church as *National*, muſt Heal our Diviſions.

It is here we muſt lay the Foundation-Stone of *Union.*

When the Parliament then ſhall ſet about this buſineſs to purpoſe, A Bill ſhould be brought in for *Declaring* the *Conſtitution* of Our *Church of England.*

A Parliament is the Repreſentative of the whole People of *England*, and I doubt not, but by Conſent and Agreement, they might *Make* a New Conſtitution of the CHURCH, as it is *National*; and much more may they *Declare* the Conſtitution of it.

The Papiſts are for one Univerſal Organical Church throughout the world, whereof the Pope is Head by Chriſt's Appintment; and whoſoever conſequently is not of this *Roman Catholick*-Church, and Governed by him, muſt be damned. There are ſome of our late Prelatiſts are for the ſame Church, but under the Dioceſan

Bishops of the whole Earth, who being Convened in a *General Council*, are the *Head* that must give laws to it; and whosoever refuse to be Govern'd by the Laws of these General Counsels, are *Schismaticks*. I am much rather therefore, in my mind, for the Notion (which is that in the Embryo the Reverend Dean of St. *Pauls* seems to me to aim at, if it could be once well formed) of an *Independent National* Church Political, but not to be held, as the Congregationalist supposes his *Particular Independent One*, and They their Catholick, to be of *Divine*, but of *Humane Institution*; for it is manifestly a thing *Accidental* to the Church of Christ, that the Supream Magistrate, and the whole Body of a Nation, are Christian.

It should be declared then in such a Bill or Act of Parliament, that the Church of *England* consists of the King as the Head, and all the several Assemblies of the Protestants as the Body.

A Discrimination between the *Tolerable* and *Intolerable* is never to be gain-said by any Wise Man.

It is not for me, or any *One* person, but a *Convocation*, or *Parliament*, to prescribe the Terms of *National Communion*; but I would have all our *Assemblies* that are *Tolerable*, to be made *Legal* by such an *Act*, and thereby parts of the *National* Church, as well as the *Parochial* Congregations.

That the Bishops should be declared Ecclesiastical Officers under the KING, acting *Circa Sacra* only by Vertue of *His* Authority and Commission.

As

As *Jehoſhophat* appointed Officers for Government in the *Matters of God*, and the *Kings Matters*: So ſhould the *Biſhops* be in Our *Eccleſiaſtical*, as the *Judges* are in *Civil* Matters, the Subſtitutes of his Majeſty, and Execute *His* Juriſdiction.

Upon this Account, if any of the Eminent among the Non-conformiſts were Choſen to be Biſhops, they could not refuſe it.

Let two or three the moſt fit of thoſe Parties be the next that are called to this Function upon ſuch an Act, and commanded to Hold it, and then would UNION indeed Commence.

Their Work in general, ſhould be to Superviſe the Churches of both ſorts in their Dioceſſes, that they all Walk according to their own Order, agreeable to the Goſpel, and the Peace of one another.

I am ſenſible unto what Diſtreſs a Congregational Miniſter may be brought in the exerciſe of Diſcipline over ſome potent, turbulent, and refractory Members; and what Relief he might find in ſuch an External Eccleſiaſtical Officer as this. I am ſenſible how the many inconveniences (ſuppoſed) of Congregational Epiſcopacy, by this one onely means may be ſalved.

This ſhall *Advance*, and not *Leſſen*, the outward Power and Honour of the *Biſhops*.

I humbly Motion a *Third* Clerk for the Convocation, to be added to the *Two* in every Dioceſs, and choſe out of the Non-conformiſts for the Unanimous proſecution of

of Holiness and Concord throughout all the Churches: And the two Provinces of *Canterbury* and *York* should Unite in this *Convocation*, for the making them one *National* Church, and not two *Provincial* ones in a diverse Assembly.

By this means should one *Organ* more be added to this great *Political* Society for deriving an influence from this Head to *these* parts of the *Body* as well as *Others*, which now seem neglected, and to have no care taken of them.

It were the part of *such* a *Convocation* to Decree that neither Church should Unchurch one another; That no members of Either should depart from One Church to the *Other* without a sufficient peaceable reason; That when a man hath his choice to be of *One* Church, which he will, in regard to *Fixed Communion*, he should *Occasionally* come also to the *Other* for maintaining this National Union.

There are these and other things of such a nature as these, I should expect then would be moulded into Canons, that kindly preventing all our scruples, would render the Nation happy, in the satisfaction of both Parties.

An Act of Parliament to this purpose, would make the Church of *England* to be in Earnest, such a Church, as the Church-men would have us still think it, the *Best Constituted*, the most *Exemplary*, and the most *Glorious* of any that is, or indeed that well can be in this World.

But

But is not all this at laſt too *Eraſtian*? I anſwer, No. We ſuppoſe that every Pariſh where there is a Paſtor and a Flock does contain in it ſuch a Particular Church as is of Chriſts Inſtitution. That Chriſt committed to every ſuch Church a compleat power of Doctrine, Worſhip, and Diſcipline. That what Chriſt hath committed to his Church cannot be taken away by any. That the Authority of the Magiſtrate is for care and overſight, and ſo to *protect* and maintain this power, but not to *deſtroy* it. That the Church as National, and Dioceſan as part of the National, and Parochial (*qua* Parochial) as part of the Dioceſan, are of Humane inſtitution, and owe their power, and preſervation of it, to the Supream Magiſtrate. That as the Magiſtrate does not take away or invade, but preſerve the *power of the Keys* (*inveſted* in the *Miniſter*, but *given* with the *Paſtor* himſelf to the *Church*), No more can the Dioceſans that Derive from him, aſſume it to themſelves, and deprive the Particular Churches of it. That ſo long as this Power is preſerved, there is no Eraſtianiſm maintained as to a *Particular* Church, and as to the *National* there is no danger of it.

And thus I have offered my Mite to the *Sanctuary*; that is, ſo much as I have, and what I think fit for Cultivation by Others, whom GOD ſhall make Wiſe-hearted, and Concern'd, for the Welfare of *Sion*.

There is Room alſo here left for the farther Invention of Such, in regard to many the like things as (or greater then) theſe: For they that will, may ſee ſomething more in a few Sheets, in *part* Entituled, *Animadverſions upon the Debate between Dr.* Stillingfleet *and Mr.* Baxter, *Concerning the National Church and Head of it.*

J. H.

THE END.